

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 4.—OCTOBER, 1883.

I.

FIRST PRINCIPLES, OR, THE SCIENCE OF THINGS.

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, D.D.

Metaphysics, A Study in First Principles, by Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1883.

THE science of metaphysics has to do with the ultimate ground of all being, whilst science investigates its external phenomena. Hence it might be supposed that the latter would engage the attention of men first, and that the former would be naturally postponed until they had made themselves better acquainted with the outward facts of the world. But history goes to show that the reverse order has been observed. From the earliest ages we find that men were prone to speculate principally on the most profound topics, when as yet their knowledge of the world was merely a minimum. This tendency to plunge into the deepest speculations, to the neglect in a great measure of other kinds of useful, elementary knowledge, continued for ages among the most cultivated nations of antiquity. In India and the Orient, philosophical systems of a dreamy, mystical character arose one after another, which lost themselves in the clouds, with no basis in any real world such

as ours ; in Greece the mists in the speculative sky cleared up in some degree, but the general tendency to speculate remained ; and during the middle ages, when the imagination was somewhat curbed and checked by the severe Latin spirit, logical air-castles were the order of the day, and scholars continued still to dream and form an ideal universe of their own. A protest, only here and there, in favor of real knowledge made itself heard. It was no doubt well that it was so, because it was necessary that men should first have an opportunity to see for themselves how empty all kinds of reasoning must be unless it has some data on which to exercise its powers. One excess begets another, and so the reaction came during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, apparently as a nemesis for the wrong perpetrated on the human mind. Physics asserted its rights and drove metaphysics out of the door. The protest came from the Anglo-Saxon mind, from a level-headed Englishman. The Baconian philosophy in a measure supplanted the sages of antiquity and the schoolmen of the middle-ages, so that for a time at least metaphysical thinking was at a discount ; and natural science absorbed men's thoughts almost to the exclusion of the profounder thoughts of the ancients. Bacon had no taste for metaphysics, and sought to divert the attention of men from the study of those deep questions which are ever springing up in the human mind. He improved the sciences immensely, but he did little for philosophy properly so called, except in an indirect manner. In some cases in fact the retaliation against what was considered as the old enemy of science went so far as to rule out metaphysical science altogether, as a useless study and an unprofitable sort of knowledge. The positive philosophy, as it is called, regards it as a thing of the past, as something which men have outlived, and for which they have no use, in that blaze of light which it imagines that it has thrown upon the world.

Thus the rage for physical science became just as one-sided as that which had gone before it. But men are born philosophers, and the tendency to metaphysical thinking cannot be

repressed by all the canons and organons which authority may set up to repress it. The next reaction commenced in Germany, in the other branch of the great Germanic race. For the last two hundred years philosophical developments have been progressing in Germany, *pari passu* with the physical sciences. In more recent times, a curious illustration of the reaction against this engrossing interest in mere physical science has been witnessed among scientific men themselves, like Tyn-dall, Huxley and Herbert Spencer, who not content to occupy their own chosen fields of science, turned metaphysicians themselves and offered to the world a philosophy of their own. Truth, involving the free progress of thought, once crushed to the earth always rises again. When one extreme succeeds in driving its old antagonist out of the field, it is only for a while, because it is sure to come back again, always improved by the discipline it has received. Such is the zigzag course of history.

The new book which we have noticed at the head of this article is an illustration of the return to metaphysical studies, even here in this practical country of ours. Such books are not common on this side of the ocean and they are therefore worthy of attention. Instead of being ignored or regarded as an intrusion, they ought rather to be welcomed, and their authors congratulated than otherwise for their courage. The author shows that he has studied the subject, and made himself familiar with the history of philosophy in its earlier and later phases. Without destroying his independence as a thinker, German philosophers, especially Kant and Herbert have had their effect on his thinking; but in the judiciousness and moderation of his statements he reminds us of Lotze, the philosophic star at present in the ascendant in Germany, to whom as a friend and former teacher he dedicates his book. He is never obscure in his language; and in this respect he appears to advantage over most German writers, not excluding Lotze himself, who do not pay sufficient attention to style, and are not always innocent of the charge of obscurity in their language, as frequently made by outsiders.

We do not propose exactly to review Prof. Bowne's book in its details, but rather to consider in our own way some of the First Principles which he discusses with the view of ascertaining whether there is any reality in the phenomenal world, or whether there is such a science as the science of things. We follow our respected author as far as we can, parting, however, from him freely where the truth seems to lead the other way. We do not hold him responsible for anything that we say, except where we quote him as authority on any given question.

Shadows and Realities. It is an irrepressible conviction of the human mind that we are surrounded by a world of real things. As these impress our various senses, our attention is aroused and we form various notions or fancies of our own in regard to them, which are purely mental, without any actual existence on the outside of us. It is, however, not always easy to distinguish these notions from the things themselves. With the majority of persons, the thought has probably never occurred that by far the largest part of what passes through their minds consists merely of impressions, with very few thoughts of real existence. Our conceptions of objects around us are nothing more than pictures, that have about as much to do with realities, as types or shadows with their substances. The names that we apply to these conceptions—we think we apply them to things—are for the most part of this empty and shadowy character. Such terms as trees, rocks, animals and innumerable other names or nouns, designate only classes of things, and do not represent things themselves; they are simply the abstractions of our own minds. Some words no doubt designate reality, but as these are found side by side in a vast pile of mere notions, it is often difficult to separate the one from the other. After centuries of angry debate, however, some progress has been made in this sifting process, and now in our day some advance has been gained, and we have authority for believing that we are coming to understand somewhat better the difference between the wheat and the chaff in our knowledge.

Abstractions Useful.—Abstractions, although nothing more than mental images, are nevertheless very useful and proper in their place. Without them, as we are now constituted, we could neither speak nor think of the numerous beings that form the world around us. Conveniently they supply us with the primary classifications of external things, in which each is made to stand in its proper place: they are the crude beginnings out of which science builds its more stately and finished structures. The mind here acts the part of an artist, forms for itself a grand museum of the universe, where nouns or names describe in more or less pictorial style each department of nature. Sometimes it goes far beyond a mere prosy accuracy, and with the creative power of genius throws around the universe of beings the brighter colorings of poetry and romance.

Abstractions as Misused.—Those creatures of the human mind, which we call abstractions, whilst they are useful in their place, become harmful when they get out of their place. This is the case when they come to be regarded as realities, or so mixed up with them as to become identified with them. As a result we get disorder, confusion, and a most irreverent caricature of the outside world. In such an adulteration, the sign is confounded with the thing signified; truth is covered up under bright-colored fancies; and the reign of idolatry is fairly inaugurated. Abstractions thus misused and abused, are idols—idola—in the strict sense of the word, and arrant impositions, which cheat the human mind by false appearances and steals from it the solid nutriment of truth. All idolatry in religion commences in this way, in the innocent use of abstractions, by some wandering band, sage, priest, or word-inventor and then advances from one step to another until universe after universe of mythical beings is formed more densely populated than the real world itself. India has more idols on its calendar than it has human beings in its cities or villages. But our intellectual idols may become as numerous as those to which men pay divine homage in India or Africa. Like Bacon we find them wherever we go, in the theatre, in the streets,

and market places, in the closet, in the dark caves of the soul, and spread everywhere among the human race; the temple of truth in our days, no less than in the time of Bacon, needs a cleansing; and in the pursuit of intellectual truth, or in the investigation of nature, the caveat of St. John applies with equal force to the philosopher as to the theologian: Little children, keep yourselves from idols.

An Iconoclastic Tendency.—But then on the other hand we ought to remember, and to be reminded, before we advance any further, that there are some terms in all languages that truthfully represent realities, which the nominalist in his iconoclastic zeal pursues as abstractions and attempts to remove—*vi et armis*—from the temple of truth. Thus here again, in the opposite direction, the interests of truth are sacrificed by its own zealots, and the way is thrown open for scepticism and agnosticism of every sort. The extreme idealist denies the existence of the outward world *in toto*, knows nothing but his own inward experiences, his own subjective thoughts or fancies, and prefers walking all his life long in the land of the shadow of death. Professor Bowne, in his gallant charge upon the great army of abstractions, the mere ghosts of things, sometimes, as it seems to us, attacks living things themselves, which are his own best friends. To some of these ill-directed assaults we may have occasion to refer as we pass along. He is constitutionally a critic, possesses more than ordinary powers of analysis; but we have failed to see in his book an equal degree of constructive energy that cannot rest until it finds rest in a synthesis. For the particular object which he has in view, he, however, does not consider that of any essential account. Rome was neither built nor destroyed in a day.

Metaphysics.—Metaphysics is frequently considered *par excellence* as the science of abstractions, and hence it has come to be regarded as of little or no value. This was probably the view of Lord Bacon; it has descended as an inheritance to his followers down to the present day. Of course, if this be the case, it deserves fully all the neglect which it has received. If its

occupation does not go beyond abstract forms, the phenomena of our own minds, then it may present an interesting arena for intellectual athletes to show their skill before an admiring crowd, and students may study it as an intellectual exercise with the view of strengthening their mental fibre; but earnest thinking persons could take no heart-felt interest in its glittering generalities. It would stand on a level with ordinary logic. It would do but little good in the world, and might be passed by, as something very harmless, possessing nothing of a general interest. But so it has never been regarded by those most concerned about the progress of the race. The greatest battles of the human mind have been fought over metaphysical questions, and the wisest and best men have engaged in such conflicts, showing that they were believed to involve vital interests to mankind at large. The occasions for such combats may have been apparently small and trifling, as in the case of many other great battles; but the sustained energy and pertinacity with which they have been maintained, prove that some great principle was involved; that it was with those who engaged in them, not a matter of self-display, but a question of life or death for the cause of man.

Whatever may be the precise sense in which the term metaphysics, *Tà μετὰ τὰ φυσικά*, was first used, whether it meant to be, *after*, *beyond*, or *with* physics, it is clear that it was intended to describe a branch of knowledge that stood in some connection with the natural world, as something deeper than physics. Aristotle taught the science without using the name, in close connection with natural science, of which he was the father; with him it was rather the completion of his physical researches than a different branch of knowledge. He called it the first philosophy, or that which underlies all other kinds of knowledge. He was famous for his love of the abstract, but he fearlessly walked through the wide sea of abstractions as if in pursuit of something really better, and this he found in the general idea of power or force that produces motion or change. Here he found a basis of reality on which he could stand, and from this

he was led to the idea of God, who was a necessity as the immovable mover of the universe. He thus became the antagonist of the old pantheistic emanations brought out by Oriental philosophy,—mere abstractions—and gained for himself a name in history which will not die. He acquired his fame, therefore, not so much by the abstractions which he piled up, as by the reality which he brought to light from the region beyond that of physics. As already said, Mr. Bowne is no special admirer of mere abstractions, and so he regards the science of metaphysics as having something to do with reality, or rather, as being chiefly concerned about real things, that lie, it is true, beyond the region of ordinary sight, but are nevertheless real and truly existent. His book is a “Study in First Principles.” He seeks everywhere to tread down empty notions, and to arrive at a “theory of things.” He regards his science as having to do with God, nature and man, and in these three primary and comprehensive ideas, he sees, not contradiction, but harmony. This is refreshing at the start, and is of itself a sufficient inducement to read his book through and through with care. It is always well to be on good terms with a fellow traveler when we start out together. It enables us to look upon subsequent differences with the eye of charity.

Taking it then for granted that there is reality beyond outward phenomena, we nevertheless find that it is something not only difficult to apprehend, but difficult to reach. There are so many obstructions in the way; abstractions spring up at every corner which claim to be things, but are mere spectres of thought; and old theories and prejudices come in to turn aside the lover of truth, so that the road is an exceedingly difficult one to travel. The best plan to pursue, perhaps, is first to try and remove some of the more prominent of these difficulties out of the way. Then afterwards we may get along our course with less distraction of mind.

Being a fiction.—Metaphysics is said to be the science of being, or of that which underlies all existences. Well, that is doubtless true, provided we are sure that we have a correct idea

of what being is. As generally understood, however, we apprehend that it is some general substance out of which individual beings have grown, much as Topsy supposed that she came into being. Sometimes it is compared to a vast ocean which embraces all things, in which they live and move and have their being. The poets have done much to create and keep up this impression: they address many fine verses to being in general, as well as to beings in particular. Here we may either regard them as falsifiers, as they were sometimes called by the old philosophers, or as misunderstood, from having indulged in undue license. We arrive at our idea of being by a process of pure abstraction. It is the last and the most general idea which we can form of the beings or subjects around us. It is so broad and so deep that the imagination can place all things that have being into it at once; but when the reason comes in and takes them all out again, as it can by another process of abstraction, there is nothing left but a dream of the mind, an airy nothing. Everything has being, doubtless; but it is its own being, something which did not come from external being in general as its source or creator.

Nature also a Fiction.—Abstract being we can give up to be sacrificed without much difficulty. As an idol it is so vast, a giant of such huge proportions, that we can allow it to be slain with some feeling of relief, because then there can be no danger of being absorbed by it,—and so forever lose our identity in its unknown depths. But it is somewhat different when we come to consider whether Nature has any better claims to our homage. In our ordinary language, as well as in the higher flights of poetry, she is continually personified, so that we grow up with the impression that she is a most beautiful dame, a bountiful mother, or at least something, the actual source of the profusion which we witness in the natural world. Of late, she has in fact been called into requisition even by scientific men themselves, to assist in upholding favorite theories of their own. Several years ago, Professor Tyndall asserted the all-sufficiency

of Nature to account for its phenomena, and the words then unfortunately dropped were caught up and applied to the support of the doctrine of evolution. It is said that he has since used more rational language. When, however, we come to consider what title this prolific old mother has to an independent existence, the delusion, with its gay colors, vanishes at once. Man has a nature, and so have fowls, fish, and other creatures; but these differ the one from the other, and when all that which is peculiar to their existence is abstracted from the general thought, there is nothing left but an empty shell without any actual nature about it whatever. These negations, however, need not prevent us from continuing to speak of the kingdoms of nature as we are accustomed to do; they may be useful; but they should help to restrain the growing tendency to deify a mere abstract notion.

When Substance is Nothing.—Every creature has a nature, and so everything has a substance underlying its existence, or giving rise to its appearances. Different bodies have peculiar substances of their own, but what the substance is, in any given case, it is affirmed, goes beyond the reach of our knowledge and must forever remain to us a mystery. So Locke wrote in the last century, and he, therefore, with his followers ever since, tell us that we should confine our inquiries to phenomena, to qualities, to appearances, to what lies within the realms of experience, and leave substances alone as unknown and unknowable quantities. This, in his view, was one of the limits of the human understanding. But we are inquisitive beings, and the progress of clearer thought will admit of no artificial barriers in its way. We all feel that we ought to know something about substances also, because, if we know nothing about the inward constitution of things, which, as we shall see, constitute their substance, we know nothing at all,—for all knowledge or truth is of this general character, and all inward activity on our part, derived from the mere outside or surface of things, is nothing more than a notion or fancy, and no true thinking at

•

all. We apprehend, therefore, that Locke's idea of substance, as a mysterious something, covered up by outward appearance, is, after all, no mystery at all, but simply an abstraction—an idol of the den—which we may safely break down with the view of substituting something in its place that will give a better account of itself. It is for practical purposes not as useful as the genii, spirits or angels that were supposed during the middle ages to reside in things and to determine their destinies. It is and should be treated as a mere dumb idol that cannot speak.

Matter as a Dead Shadow.—And now we must next consider matter, which, as a word, we meet with quite as often in books as nature or substance, and as a thing is supposed to be surrounding us wherever we go. It must certainly be a reality, it is imagined, as we have so many palpable evidences of its existence every day of our lives. The proof of this is supposed to be found in our senses, all five of them; but these are not quite as infallible as they are sometimes supposed to be. They often deceive us, as when they tell us that the sun rises and sets, and give us such wrong notions about the heavenly bodies. They are very poor astronomers, and science must come in and correct them at every point. In the search after truth we must often, in fact, fight against our senses; and, in order to gain it, as a philosopher once dryly remarked, we must sometimes get out of our senses; and so it may be here with matter, which has established such an extensive empire in the thinking of men in all ages. It may, likewise, be nothing more than a figment of the brain.

The question here to be settled, whether matter has any existence or not, depends also on what we are to understand by it. The common conception which we have of it is, that it has extension,—that is, length, breadth and thickness,—and occupies space. This, of course, is sufficient for all practical purposes; it teaches us to get out of its way when it comes; and science can readily handle it under this view, weigh it, and

measure its capacities for useful purposes. It is a good "working hypothesis," as scientists call their suppositions when they do not wish to be bothered about their truth or falsity. When, however, we begin to think about the bodies which are formed out of matter, we find that they are all compounds made up of parts of the same or different kinds of matter; and peering down to their foundations, we arrive at last at ultimate atoms, which are simple and not compounds,—something hard, indivisible, but still occupying space,—which brings them, after all, under the old denomination of matter. There they are, material atoms, very small, forming by their union the substance of intellectual commerce, called matter in English, and stoff in German. In themselves they are inert and helpless, as all matter is supposed to be; but then they are found to be endowed with various forces, such as attraction and repulsion, by which they act upon each other and so build up the outward universe. They are very small, but as they are surrounded on all sides by vacant spaces or pores, which, as they are immense as compared with the size of the atoms, leave a free range for the activities of the forces, which somehow or other took a liking to them and made them the basis of their operations.

Such is the old and perhaps still current theory of matter. But it is very easy to see that it is a mere hypothesis. It rests altogether on certain hypothetical solid atoms, which no one has ever seen, can see, or ever will see, no matter how perfect future instruments for magnifying purposes may become. The supposition of such hard, extended atoms breaks down, however, as soon as the penetrating eye of reason is fixed upon them for a while. Of what imaginable use can they be? They are supposed to be centres of action, whilst the forces are qualities or gifts with which they are endowed. But what communion or connection can there be between a hard, inert atom and the active nature of restless forces? It would be the communion between light and darkness. It is just as easy to conceive that forces have location, and are just as active in their self-poised

centres without such points as with them; and if so, the hard points can be ruled out as unnecessary and gratuitous, as mere fetich, which has been handed down from remote ages. Electricity and magnetism have no weight, and it is not likely that they are under the necessity of dragging after them solid atoms wherever they go in their quick motions. This seems to be the conclusion at which scientific men themselves are arriving at the present day. All their investigations lead them to maintain that matter is force and nothing else,—that there is no such dualism as is implied when we speak of matter and its forces as two distinct things; and that, if the language is used at all, it should be in the way of accommodation, as when we say that the sun rises or sets. Mr. Bowne, as we understood him, is inclined to take this dynamic view of matter: "The solidity of the mass," he says, "is not the integral of the solidities of the elements, but depends entirely upon a certain balance of attraction and repulsion among the elements. Hence we may say that materiality is but the product of a dynamism beneath it." The further we think of the matter, the more apparent are the incongruities which spring up when we adopt the hypothesis of solid mechanical atoms. As we cannot reach or touch them in any way, they can be moved from one place to another, only as they are dragged along by their forces; but this would be only a waste of force, where nothing would be gained. Nature always acts economically, and so it seems right to rule out this hypothetical matter, that acts as a dead weight on her energies as well as on our thinking.

Nothing but Energies or Living Forces.—If then we dismiss material points altogether as useless and pernicious, as a clog to all free thoughts, then the whole conception of matter as held for ages vanishes into thin air, as the baseless fabric of a dream. As a mere abstraction it may be useful, but it has done much harm in theology, philosophy and religion. It is the old Greek Hyle, which as shapeless stuff was the source of all evil; and, as material for good purposes, it ruled out God as

a Creator and made Him only an architect. It thus gave rise to a hopeless dualism, formed two principles in creation as opposite and antagonistic as light and darkness, and just as irreconcilable. As a matter of course all heathen, and to great extent Christian theology also, was pervaded with this idea of stuff. We may hope that with the progress of modern thought, which is constantly eliminating one persistent error after another from the sphere of truth, we may be emancipated from the influence of this as well all other kinds of useless stuff.

Dismissing then the material idea of matter we substitute in its place that which is purely dynamical. This we regard not only as something necessary, but also as useful in every respect. The tendency will help very much to unify the universe and go very far to unify our thoughts in regard to it. It takes away the old heathen idea of dead matter, something opposed to the spirit of the Bible, and presents to our view the universe as the product of living forces. Force in one form or another is paramount in all departments of creation; Nature is dynamical, History is dynamical, and with reverence let it be spoken, God Himself is supremely dynamical. The universe is of one substance—force—we may say, provided we do not allow it to run into one mould or homogeneous mass, an all-alikeness, and become an abstraction as in the case of matter, or in the occult abstract infinite substance of Spinoza. Forces are living things, closely allied to thought, and differing widely one from the other in intensity and quality, from their humblest beginnings at atomic centres up to the powers which control the thoughts and actions of an archangel. They do not permit themselves to form a shapeless mass, but love order, maintaining their places, as spheres within spheres, numerous, diverse, energizing and yet in the end forming one sphere that embraces all the rest.

Entities or Things. With much that has thus far been said as introductory to what here follows, we are now prepared to speak of things or realities. In a discussion of this character, we premise by simply reminding our readers of the saying that

"things are not always what they seem to be." To get some light on this subject it is best to commence with a single thing, and from it learn what it has to say in regard to itself and the mystery of its own being. We sit in a room and looking out of the window we see a tree. What, now, is it? It certainly would not be a full and truthful answer to say that it is so much woody material—mostly carbon—brought together and reduced to the shape presented to the eye. We know that there is something back of all this in the life of the tree, a power or law that has given it its form, its trunk, branches and leaves. This is essential to the idea of the tree, without which it would no longer be a tree. Our common sense takes this in at once, and so we say that a tree must needs be a living thing. Now we would not shock this same common sense by saying that the tree which we see with our eyes, is something invisible, that the law of growth, abstractly considered, is the tree itself. There is room here for a compromise. The tree properly speaking is not what we see with the eye; nor yet the inner life or law which we see with our reason. The union of the two here make the thing, the real tree. The life of the tree, working by an imminent law of its own, takes up various substances from the soil or the atmosphere, shapes them into a form of its own, all by a process of a most wonderful character; and so we have a tree. Describing it then in a word we say that it is an activity, not abstract but real, involving the real power which is ever feeding its activity. Such a simple illustration as this, taken from our department of nature, is sufficient to illustrate beings in general. If in other departments we question a man or an animal, we get a similar reply. Even the mineral refuses to admit that it is a mute, dead thing, and asserts its essentially active character, as we have already seen.

Such is the view of the Boston professor, we are happy to say, in regard to reality or real existence. On this point he is very emphatic, repeating the same thoughts over and over again, so that there is no danger of misapprehending him. We quote only a few passages that first arrest the eye from the thorough-

ly exhaustive chapter on the "Notion of Being." "In this sense of the word," he says, "we should say that all the realities of the universe are powers, and that the phenomenal universe is but the manifestation of hidden powers; a thing does not exist by virtue of a kernel of reality through the activity whereby it affirms itself as a determining factor of the system." "Actor and act are the two basal categories of thought; and when we have referred a phenomenon to its cause or causes we have explained it. When we grasp this fact, it becomes clear that being must be viewed as essentially active. However thick the mental fog may be, it must always be plain that only the active will explain action." This view of the case, as a matter of course, brings men and what we call things closely together, but that is just what should be. The external world is much more spiritual in its nature, and a much more congenial abode for spiritual beings during their stay in it, than the old philosophers were accustomed to teach. The fact is, they were befogged not a little. As they possessed only a dim conception of God, the Supreme Good and Beautiful, they could not see anything spiritual, beautiful, or good in the work of His hands.

Germes or Possibilities.—Things* then are active forces or energies,—not the "useless or baseless fictions of an inert core of rigid reality," as our author says. But it may be useful to give some further account of them so that we may become better acquainted with them. They all have some sort of a history, a rise, a progress and a consummation. So far as our own experience goes, we must conclude that all beings start in germes. We have not a single instance within the range of human observation in which any creature came into existence fully developed. Athena may have sprung from the brain of Jupiter full grown and in complete armor; but that is a myth. In ordinary life's experience, everything has a beginning; and man himself, the greatest and noblest of all creatures, springs from an origin apparently so insignificant that it seems to border on the region of mere non-entity. Angels who live beyond

the region of human experience, no doubt commenced their being in the same way. Created as fully developed they would be the work of magic, not of reason. Germs involve in themselves the possibilities of fully developed creatures. All the activities that make their appearance in the latter lay folded up in the former from the beginning. How this can be we do not know. It is a fact to which reason compels us to assent; for, if we do not here yield to her behests, we are at once plunged into a sea of magic, from which there is no means at hand for us to make our escape. The possibilities here are real, involving always the necessary power of realizing themselves outwardly in things. Prof. Bowne speaks of all possibilities or potentialities as abstractions, but he fails to distinguish between an abstract and a concrete possibility. The possibilities in actual creatures are all real and concrete, involving all the necessary forces or energies to realize themselves in time and space. This they are bound to do by a cause or law within themselves, which they themselves cannot resist, provided nothing comes in the way to hold the law in abeyance for the time. We are accustomed to say that the growth or development commences when what are called favorable conditions are at hand. All these our author regards as causes also, and is disposed to ignore the old distinction between cause and condition. In this, however, we think he fails to exhibit his usual acumen, overlooks an obvious distinction, and obscures the true nature of cause. The cause of a thing is in itself, and not on the outside, in its controlling law, which is synonymous with its very nature or substance. But why it may be asked does the cause or inner law not always act as in the case of the grain of wheat which lies inactive in the folds of a mummy for centuries? The usual answer is that the necessary conditions are not present. When it is removed to some other place and surrounded by more favorable circumstances, it vegetates and grows. Thus favorable conditions, involving the activity of various forces from without, by interaction have a stimulating effect on the growth of animals and vegetables,

but it is only as they submit to be used by living organisms for their own purposes and not as ruling factors. But very often they refused to be thus ruled, and so they are purely negative in character. When a plant or animal ceases to grow, it is because in some way paralyzed, and the law of growth is held in abeyance for the time. When this oppression is once removed, then its activity, again set free, asserts itself. The grain of wheat during the winter is in bondage and remains what it is until spring, when its fetters being removed and its activity having other activities to feed on, it resumes its activity and pursues its destiny. Thus what are called favorable conditions to growth, life or progress have nothing of the nature of a cause about them, except to themselves, and imply simply that they have nothing obstructive about them, and that they offer themselves to be freely used by the power that commands their obedience. The distinction here between the actor and its surroundings, which Prof. Bowne strangely overlooks, is a valid one, and useful in keeping the mind fixed on real causes and their nature. The activities involved in a favorable condition are numerous, have the law or cause of their own action in themselves; but they are not law or cause to anything else, and least of all to that which they are compelled to obey.

Things as Ideas or Thoughts.—When we look at things as activities or forces we are constantly in danger of receiving the impression that they are brutal and dumb, and it is therefore necessary to look a little further into their internal character. As a result we shall see there is in fact no such a thing as a brute force among them. An examination will show that they are all pervaded with the light of intelligence and reason, from the lowest atomic centre up to the highest organization in man; and we see further the same intelligence as they combine and work for the completion of the system of the universe in which they are the humble workers. This shows itself during the entire process from the acorn to the oak, from the silk-worm to the butterfly, from the egg to the fowl. Everywhere we see

the operations going forward in accordance with a fixed law and a rational order, in which means are selected and adapted for the end in view or the object to be accomplished. Thus the tree which we gaze at through the window embodies an unconscious wisdom in its growth which may be studied by the naturalist for a life-time; and even then he would probably not get to the bottom of it. In every reality, especially in organisms, there is a unity which shows itself in diversity, a generality that holds all the individuals together in one communion and gives them their vitality. All this serves to bring the world of reality within the sphere of thought, raises it out of the quagmire of the old chaotic matter, and makes it a congenial home for rational and intelligent creatures. The ideas or thoughts here in active embodiment are, therefore, real things, are the things themselves in their essential character, neither abstractions nor forces ruling them from the outside. Plato first taught the value of ideas in the formation of the universe, and by their use made a vast stride in the explanation of its true nature; but his ideas were something external to matter, the models according to which all bodies were formed by something else. He, of course, could not think otherwise with his knowledge of matter, or the old hypothetical stuff, out of which as material, that which is something, had to be formed, and so the old philosophers could not understand how the many could come from the one. Of course they could not. They started from a dead unit, not a unity. With the advance of science, we are in a condition to improve on Plato's theory, and in an important respect simplify the whole process. We dismiss the entire dark realm of material stuff on the one hand, and, on the other, the soul of the world—the *anima mundi*—with that host of middle-men—the æons—which compressed matter into bodies within the moulds of ideas; and then we have nothing else to do but to make ideas the substance of things themselves. Thus the sky became clear and we got into the region of ideas which are realities, and, are in a condition to learn that there is something beyond the skies. Ideas sug-

gest *ex necessitudine rerum* a thinker, and their actualization in bodies or things from the same necessity suggests a supreme will. Thus the infinite and the finite come together by a much more natural and easy process than philosophers suppose. The difficulties that separate God from man in the intellectual world, are just as great as in the sphere of morals and religion, —but they are all placed there by man himself, by his interminable love of idols, by abstractions or thoughts which are altogether his own.

It may, however, be thrown back upon us that, if things are thoughts or ideas, then thoughts are things, and so we arrive at the identity of thought and being, which is by many regarded as one of the pernicious extremes in philosophy. Of course it would be vicious as well as pernicious, if thought were identified with being as an abstraction or nullity, for that would reduce the whole system of things back again into nonentity; but we have been trying all along to obtain a more sober and realistic view of being, and as we have found it in the activity of creatures, evolving itself in a rational order of sequence, we do not think that being has suffered any indignity at all, but rather the opposite, when it is identified with reason or ideas, for in this way it is in fact exalted and glorified.

Of course the stumbling-block here is that we are accustomed to regard all thought or thoughts, as exclusively subjective or ideal, having their exclusive home in our own minds. But thoughts, at least such as are true thoughts, come to us from an objective order of things outside of us. They grow up in our own minds, it is true, but they are true thoughts, only as they correspond to their objective realities which is truth. For the most part they fall short of the reality, as experience shows, and that is the source of all our trouble in science as well as in philosophy and religion. We are continually in danger of being imposed on, because we are asked to take the subjective thoughts of individuals for realities. This, we admit, is a pernicious kind of identity. Perhaps however, the very impartial identity of our thoughts with the thoughts of God in the

universe, if the matter is sufficiently pondered over, would tend to show that man bears some resemblance to his Maker. If beings are supposed to imply a Supreme Being, then thoughts ought to imply one Supreme Thinker.

The Sovereignty of Things.—Things are realities not mere shadows or phenomena; they are energies, not mere fleeting forms; they have a history, a beginning and an end, a rational activity, and an amount of wisdom and intelligence in their operation, which confounds all our ordinary subjective intelligence. And now, if this be so, we say further that they exercise within their sphere a certain kind of sovereignty and sub-independence. Each is, or should be, as in the case of persons, a law unto itself. In their creation God Himself endowed them with these gifts, and, as He is unchangeable, He does not revoke any of His laws. They have their being in the elements of light and intelligence. All such creatures below man are unconscious, it is true, and have no wills of their own; but in the place of will there is an inflexible law; and back of this there is an omnipotent will, and so they hold their smaller or larger realms in absolute subjection. Thus the animal rules over the vegetable, makes use of it for such purposes as its necessities may require in building up its body and maintaining it in its normal condition. The vegetable in a similar way subsidizes the activities of the mineral world, selecting such as it needs for its purposes, from myriads of others in the ground or the atmosphere around it, and bidding them obey its behests. The atoms also, the most insignificant of all creatures, retreating from sight into a mere point next to nothing, asserts and maintains position at least on the border of non-existence; and thus it establishes for itself a throne and fills its realm to the exclusion of everything else. This is the true character of its impenetrability.

Modern science has, as we think, fully established the claims of things to a species of subordinate autonomy, and in this way performed an enduring service to the world, for which the stones of the field, the trees of the forest, the stars in their courses,

animals and men, should rise up and give it thanks. These ruling powers in things, which we are accustomed to call *secondary causes*, implying a distinction with a real difference, must be maintained, if we wish to keep in the sunlight and not get back again in the old pantheistic fogs.

Secondary Causes.—Secondary causes, chiefly the product of modern wisdom, have always been regarded with more or less suspicion from the stand-point of religion. Bishop Berkeley denied that they had any existence whatever, and therefore ruled out an objective world altogether, in his zeal for the honor of the great First Cause. This, however, is not so bad or unwise as when secondary causes are magnified and glorified so as to supersede the First Cause, which no doubt Berkeley apprehended as the possible coming event. It is the way of the world; and it is an old controversy, this question of the relation of the finite to the infinite, of the natural to the supernatural, and has its roots nowhere else but in the present condition of our minds. We here seem to be subject to two magic poles, both of which have the opposite powers of attraction and repulsion. One class of persons are attracted towards the one, and another class naturally gather around the other. The line of separation may be seen running through small as well as large communities. We may see it in the most select social circle which may be brought together, not for idle talk but for earnest interchange of thought. Let there be, for instance, a meeting of this kind held once a week or once a month. It is made up of different classes of persons. Some are lawyers, some are editors, some business men, some are professors in the several departments of a university, some are clergymen, some are doctors of the law, some of theology, some of philosophy, and some are doctors of medicine. The ladies are also represented, from the mother in Israel to the lass in her teens, and all are educated and intelligent; some have travelled, some are literary, some are musicians, poets or painters, and all artistic in their tastes. As they take their seats a dissertation is read on some depart-

ment of history, of literature, of science, morals or politics, and the way is then open for remarks. In the discussion that follows, if it is at all a discussion, the company is sure to divide on some apparently unknown principle of affinity; some are sure to explain everything on natural principles, whilst others are just as certain to call in supernatural and philosophical principles for the true explanation; and, if the debate becomes a little heated, assaults come from each little camp with quick retorts. The probability is that both are right at first, and both wrong as the fusilade continues. As Dr. Rauch says, there is an *inner* and an *outer sense*; some have the one and some the other. The finite has its rights and so has the infinite; the one cannot exclude the other: each is necessary to the other; and there is no uncrippled truth in philosophy, science, art or religion, except as the two are made to stand in harmonious relations to each other. But so it is; the strife goes on; book after book is written and answered, and men—even good, true ones also—will not believe that the question is settled. As said above, the difficulty is purely subjective, in a certain degree of crookedness in one nature, or as theologians call it, an innate depravity. If such be the case, it can be removed and the strife ended, only as the contestants are elevated into some such an ideal realm as that which is offered to us in Christianity, where charity is the ruling power and takes into its embrace the finite as well as the infinite, the natural as well as the supernatural.

The author of the work before us is very earnest in his discussion of these profound themes, and his conclusions generally seem to us to be such as should command general consent. He is professedly realistic, and, without much profession, intensely theistic; but, from expressions which he occasionally lets fall, we are left in doubt whether he is, after all, really realistic. Thus, in the chapter on the "Cosmos as Mechanism," he expresses himself: "The conception of matter as something given and fixed, we repudiate entirely. We hold then to a phenomenal materialism and an absolute spiritualism. Matter is simply

a form of manifestation, of which the reality is the immanent God." This sounds to us as Berkeleyan and slightly pantheistic, to both of which tendencies, however, the author in other places objects. In his book, moreover, as a whole, we have not observed that he places any special emphasis on secondary causes. To us this determination seems to be a matter of the utmost importance in order to maintain the proper relation between the finite and the infinite, and serve as a barrier against the fearful maelstrom of pantheism, which mixes all things together, human and divine, and devours the whole universe of thought. It is right to honor God, but it is also right to respect His creatures, and to give them due credit for what they are. They are His thoughts, His words and His acts; and if man was made in His image, they also in their own way reflect His image and glory, not as something antagonistic to His nature and being, but related to Him as His handiwork.

Things as Creatures.—Only a cursory view of the universe shows us, as science may be said to have demonstrated, that it is the result of a process extending over many ages; but when we look down into the foundations of beings, and see what they start from as mere germinal activities, we arrive at a point where we meet with basal facts which cannot be derived from any other facts. We may apprehend them with our reason without any difficulty as facts; but it baffles all our powers of comprehension in our attempts to deduce them from something else. Beyond them all is a dark and empty void, when we look for an outward *πᾶν στῶν*. In vain, with the help of our imaginations, we conjure up such fanciful forms as an ocean of being, the womb of nature, or a formless chaos of matter for something on which to build our facts. These, as we have seen, are pure abstractions, and they only help to increase the darkness. But the very nature of the facts themselves show where they come from and who is their author. As thoughts and energies, they could proceed only from a Supreme mind and a Supreme will. Creation is the word that solves the difficulty and sheds light

over the dark profound; and if there are those who reject it because they cannot comprehend it, they are quite welcome to produce some solution which others can comprehend as well as themselves. But the beings that are now in the world are creatures just as truly as those who formed the first links in being's endless chain. Properly speaking, creation is a continuous act on the part of the Creator; for the same power, wisdom and thought are exercised in holding the worlds from sinking into naught as when they were first brought out of naught into being.

A Cosmos.—In studying the science of things we are, in the nature of the case, under the necessity of beginning with individuals,—of calling them up separately and questioning each one whether it is anything real, whether it has any actual existence, whether it is only an apparition, a spectre of the brain, or not. Strange to say, the greatest philosophers, either with faith or without it, who take nothing for granted, have made this necessary. Think of the extravagances of Hegel, Fichte, and even of Kant and Berkeley. But, after the trial is ended and the facts in the case vindicated, then we find that these truthful creatures constitute a universe, in which the same order, reason and reality appear as in each individual. How is this possible, we may ask? Certainly, not by chance. It is easy to conceive how the atoms, when sufficient hosts of them were once created, should go to work and form the sun and the stars, and then the oceans and the solid lands, as a suitable abode for other creatures that should follow after they had finished their gigantic work. But the difficulty is to understand how they obtained their wonderful capacities to form such a globe as ours; and how they acquired such an adaptedness to prepare the way for the higher orders of creatures that were to inhabit it. Plant life we may also admit as a fact and a creation, but the question is how it became what it was, enriching the soil of the earth for the growth of the higher orders of plants, that in their turn would be a necessity for the exist-

ence of man and animals ; and why, for instance, at one period of its reign, its developments should become so rich and exuberant that it was enabled to lay up in the earth that abundance of coal which millions of years afterwards, in our time, should become the outward means of carrying the progress of history onward to its highest degree of progress.

It is clear enough that such an order of things as a universe is not possible without a corresponding cause, and hitherto we have merely considered individual beings only as integral parts, and for these we have asserted a kind of independent existence ; but now we must further qualify our remarks. The independence here is not absolute but relative ; else we should have a mere aggregation of selfish, discordant elements, that would forever stand apart and never enter into any sort of community. How shall this unity be brought about ?

This question is usually answered by bringing in the direct agency of the Author of the Creation. It is affirmed, and very truthfully, also, that He had a general plan in His mind when He formed the universe, just as He had before Him a specific plan when He created individual beings, and that the former as the more general should control the latter. Leibnitz conceived of his monads as self-determining, but he felt compelled to bring in his theory of a pre-established harmony to restore harmony among his separatistic monads and engage them to work together peacefully in a common purpose or plan. The two postulates in his theory are generally regarded as in conflict with each other, but they need not be so necessarily. They were not so in his own mind, for Leibnitz certainly believed in God as well as monads. Prof. Bowne has no theory of his own to present, acknowledges the difficulty, and then uses the fact to show the necessity of a basal agency, "an all embracing being, which is the unity of the many, and in whose unity an interacting plurality first becomes."

These are brave words, certainly. In general the assumption that it is the divine plan, or call it what we may, the divine purpose, the divine harmony or the divine predestination, that es-

tablishes the harmony of the universe, is doubtless true, and to the mass of men, who believe in divine things at all, it is altogether satisfactory and unassailable. It is, however, in itself no explanation; it is simply the statement of an indisputable fact; but our critical age will not rest satisfied with mere statements, even in religion, wherever there is the least prospect of a rational explanation. The happy family of believers may be satisfied, but the unbelievers will not be, and so they will give us no rest, ever and anon challenging us for the reason of the faith that is in us, or trying to subvert it, so as to place some false idol in its place for us to worship. Thus we are thrown on the defensive and compelled to philosophize whether we will or not. Skeptics and infidels, who complain so loudly about the dogmatizing of the Christian Church ought to remember that it is for the most part their own fault. All dogmas grow up through conflicts and are only so many guns placed on the ramparts of truth to keep out the enemy. We may indeed suppose that all individuals are adapted to each other, so that when they come together they co-operate with each other in the realization of some general plan. But this adaptedness of one part for the other, is already something general and goes beyond the individual. The interaction is a fact, but it needs explanation. To say that God does it is also a fact; but does He do it by standing over each individual, directly commanding it to do its duty, or does He do it in and through a competent, energizing thought or word of His own? That is the question. Men are quite willing to believe in the transcendence of God, but that soon becomes an abstraction, unless it is held in close connection with His immanence. He is in His holy temple, and that is His universe.

Evolutionism.—The yearning of the human mind for a satisfactory solution of this problem shows itself in the modern doctrine of evolution. When it was first proposed by Lord Monboddo, a century ago,—that man was the descendant of an ape—it was met with universal ridicule. At the present time it is pretty widely accepted as a hypothesis by scientific men. Many

facts seem to favor it; but we cannot but believe that its popularity is largely due to the strong desire to see unity in nature; and that, as no other theory has been so largely developed, and it seems to be the only candidate in the field, it ought to be accepted for the present. It further connects itself with the idea of development, which starting in Germany, and usefully employed in all departments of knowledge, has gone forth and taken possession of the minds of scholars throughout the world. Everything now that has being is considered in the light of development, and very truthfully also, for development is manifestly a law both of nature and history. This the evolutionist feels, and so he goes to work to evolve the whole system of nature out of some primary substance, such as protoplasm, or a few starting points at the bottom of inorganic nature. The primary question, however, here, is whether he starts at the right end of the process, for whilst we all believe in development, there are many so called developments, which are not *Entwicklung* but *Verwicklung*.

The most pronounced opposition to evolution comes from the side of religion, and its supposed opposition to the teachings of the Bible. But if it gives a truthful account of the order in which God created the world, and it can be proved to do so, then there can be no difficulty on that score and no conflict with divine revelation. Moreover, there are not a few Christian evolutionists, and they may be depended on to give the hypothesis such a shape as will least offend the Christian consciousness.

Thus one of its first advocates, the author of the *Vestiges of Creation*, meets the objections of his critics by supposing that the creative energy in the beginning was more exuberant than it is now in our present settled order of things, and that it increased in intensity as each new and higher order of beings was called for. Thus the tide of divine power rose higher and higher until it was adequate to form the most complete beings, such as man, where it rests and has no longer any ebbs and flows. Professor Dana, of New Haven, believes that man came from the ape, but that the change or transformation was brought about

in a miraculous way during his embryonic state in the womb of his ancestor. Most persons would sooner believe that, if the first man ever was in an embryonic state, he was first found in some running brook in Paradise, taken up, and cherished by angels rather than monkey parents. But this may be a mere matter of taste. Such explanations and concessions help to relieve the theory of much that is objectionable, although they seem to involve to some extent a sacrifice of consistency. They concede the miracle in the creation of each successive creature as in the old doctrine, which is the main point, so that the new view, from the stand-point of religion, does not differ essentially from the old. If the premises are correct, no body has a right to object to the conclusions.

But the strongest objection, as we look at it, to evolution comes from the metaphysical standpoint. It has no charms for such an able and acute thinker as Professor Bowne, nor will it probably ever attract any considerable number of thinkers, who like him have traversed the field of philosophy from Plato down to Kant and the German idealists. It has before it yet a good many battles to fight; after it has once settled all its difficulties with the scientists themselves and with religion, it will have to encounter a whole camp full of metaphysicians with their glittering lances. As at present held it sets at defiance, old and well established principles of metaphysical science. It doubtless embodies much truth, and may be the means of preparing the way for something else which will give a better solution of the unity of the universe, as Des Cartes' theory of vortices led to that of Sir Isaac Newton. But it will have to pass through more evolutions than it has already, before it becomes ripe, so as to satisfy a true philosophical taste.

The problem which we here have to encounter, when we are asked to show how the co-operation and interaction of multitudes of agents resulted in the formation of the universe is a difficult one, and one also which may never be answered in a satisfactory manner. What we have to say in regard to it in this place,

therefore, we wish to be regarded simply as contributory to its solution. Most probably, when we have done our best, we may be able to throw only some feeble light over this dark and mysterious realm.

The Cosmos as Organism.—Our Boston philosopher, in his book, has an admirable chapter on the "Cosmos as Mechanism," in which he truthfully shows the usefulness of such a theory; but at the same time points out its inadequacy, and also the mischief to which it leads when the attempt is made to apply it to facts that lie beyond its reach in the organic world. He seems to be aware of the existence of an organic theory of the universe, but strange to say, he makes very little use of it, much less to dignify it by devoting to it an entire chapter. He rejects it, in fact, except so far as it holds the unity of nature and makes room for final causes. His objections to it, however, as it seems to us, have force only as they are directed against certain forms of it, which may be all false, and yet the theory itself may be true. That which it postulates "as something between the conscious intelligence of God and a blind and necessary mechanism," may not be a mysterious instinct, Cudworth's plastic power, Plato's soul of the world, an hypostasis of nature, nor an abstract idea, but something more concrete and real, something more allied to God, on the one hand, and to the creature on the other. If he had sought this out and found it, he might, we think, have written a still more admirable chapter on Cosmos an Organism; and this would have given more completeness to his "First Principles."

To a certain extent the human body may be regarded as a mechanism, but it is vastly more than a finished piece of machinery. It is an organism, and involves many more principles than those which are strictly mechanical. And so we feel that it must be with the universe. Everybody now knows that it did not come into being piecemeal; that it is a genesis; and that it proceeded from within like an organism and not from without as a mechanism.

Everything here depends on what we are pleased to consider as an organism. Surrounded as we are by plants and animals, we get our first impressions of what is an organism from them, and we are ever afterwards tempted to regard them as the measure of all other organisms. But there are many different kinds of organisms; some of vast and grand proportions, that have not in them literally the juice of plants nor the blood of animals to keep up the unity of their organs or parts. Thus it is with the solar system, which proceeded from a single principle, the interaction of attraction, and the primitive projectile force, and is held to gether still by the same force. The planets also are vast organisms, because they were not formed by any sort of manipulation, as if by a large hand rolling together so much matter, and giving them their shape; but by the agency of hidden principles, which are still in operation. This is a lesson which Geology teaches us most palpably in regard to our own planet. The same conclusion we feel must hold good with regard to the macrocosm as a whole. The organism here is in many respects different from that of the animal, the tree or the solar system, for it rises immeasurably above them, both in magnitude, in complexity of parts, and in their diversified natures or qualities that attach to each. It may be an organism *sui generis*, and yet as it is a unity in diversity, with a movement of the whole as well as of the parts from within and not from without, we cannot hesitate for a moment to consider it organic. Such being the case, we must search for the principle of the unity of the universe not in an abstraction, not in some hypothetical principle summoned from the vasty deep to serve our purposes, but in something that is now really in existence and also within the system itself.

Man as Microcosm. Metaphysically speaking we object to the present system of evolution because it seeks for its principle at the extreme end of creation, and not at the centre; on the borders of existence, on the surface, and not at the heart of the system. Reason would lead us to infer that if found at all, it

should be rather at the other end of the process, at the top, not at the bottom ; at the centre, and not in the periphery. Now it is man who occupies such a central position, and he is the most comprehensive of all created beings. Such being the case, a full and complete idea of man comprehends, as a logical necessity, all other kinds of existences. It is plain, if we believe at all in an All-Wise Being, that His main object in creating this world of ours, at least, was the formation of such a being as man, who should bear His image in creation, be His vicegerent among all other creatures, radiant with the light of intelligence, glowing with the affections of love and tenderness, the centre of nature, with the universe as its echo and not the converse. We cannot for a moment suppose that the divine wisdom could exhaust itself in framing mere worlds of matter and then throwing them into space to witness their motions, overpowering as they appear to us. Such creatures He could admire, but not love nor have any communion with. Rational and intelligent beings alone could meet the exigences of the case, and so man was formed that he might be the energizing centre of the universe, the starting point of all other existences, the connecting link between them and the infinite Source of all being. The idea of man then is the central, ruling idea of the cosmos, out of whose potent, potential energy all things sprang into being under the supreme direction and the supreme control.

But here on the very threshold of our discussion we are told that the idea of humanity is an abstraction, such as were supposed to have been slain long ago ; or at least by Prof. Bowne's book. But to this we reply with an emphatic negative ; here we make strenuous issue with the nominalists, and our Boston friend also, if we understand him aright. Most generalities, we are free to acknowledge, are abstract, but not all of them ; some of them at least are concrete, and the most real of all things. Botany and Zoölogy has proved this, by bringing out the genera and species of plants, animals, and showing that they are not abstractions, but entities. Of such a character is the idea of man in his generality. He develops himself freely as

an individual, but he develops himself also as a social being in society. This he can do only as a more general and fundamental activity brings him into communion with his fellow individuals, and constitutes them a unity. Only a superficial study will convince us that the ideas of the State and the Church are not abstractions, but realities, potentialities, real things. No interaction of individuals could bring them about. They are concrete generalities, included under the still more general idea of man, as spheres within a sphere, from which they derive all their potency. No person, when he comes to reflect for a moment can believe that humanity is a mere mass, or aggregation of individuals like so many bricks in a house. Man is both genus and species in one. The union here is more like that which connects the branches of a tree or the various organs in the animal body. It is and must be organic, and can never be regarded without a shudder as external or mechanical. We have seen that the beings or creatures in this cosmos of ours are activities, forces, unities, thoughts, ideas, and all sovereign in their spheres; and now we maintain that these determinations pertain to man as a whole as well as to other creatures, with equal and even more propriety. Taken in his entirety he is the grandest of all God's thoughts, and as the centre of the cosmos the most fundamental and comprehensive. This latter assertion may appear to be a mere platitude or glittering generality; but as it is a vital link in our discussion, it must be looked into for a moment, so that we may see whether it can be established on a solid basis.

Our current idea of man includes body, soul and spirit, common to each individual; and there are at this late day few who do not believe that these constitute a unity, an indivisible totality, which shows itself in diversity, no matter which of these we regard as primary and fundamental. But as we come to reflect somewhat longer on the subject, we will see that such an idea of man is too much restricted and needs to be extended. If we were thus to define man to an entire stranger in our universe, unacquainted with our system of nature or order of life, the de-

inition would be meaningless. To give such a being or creature a clear apprehension of what man is, it would be necessary to tell him where he lives, to refer to all his surroundings in the system to which he belongs, to the planet in which he lives, to what is above him, around him and beneath him, then to point out his relations to these things, and the exposition would not be complete, until his position in the entire cosmos were defined. Then he would have some proper idea of what man is.

Now such must have been the idea of man in the mind of God when He came to posit him in the creation. As a thought or energy he was the central activity from which rays of light and energy went forth to the very periphery of the universe. So it is with our own thoughts, when we have pure thoughts at all, which are always generalities, not pictures or mere notions of our own. One thought generates another, and this latter a third,—and so the process goes on until we form unities within unities, sphere within sphere, until we get a little universe of our own, which varies in dimension in proportion to the breadth of range or generality of the first thought. Nor can we suppose that the flow of God's ideas was in any material respect different from that of ours, when He came to posit a universe in time and space. In the first place, if we are allowed to speak of Him in this human way, He conceived the thought or idea of man (although this conception must date from all eternity), and then in this principal, leading thought was involved by necessity, potentially, all those subordinate thoughts which go to make up the universe. There was, however, this vast difference between God's thoughts and our thoughts. All our thoughts are subjective; they come and go; and it is only in some small degree that we ever come to actualize them; and even then it is not a creation after all, but simply a matter of arrangement, or a making of things. With God it was otherwise. His thoughts were also acts; a power of will pervaded them; and hence they became a process of creation, which was the unfold-

ing of one central thought, that suggested, controlled and necessitated all the rest.

*Ignem est ollis vigor, et ecclēstis origo
Seminibus.* Vir. Aen. Lib. vi. 730.

If we were here speaking theologically, we should say that all this was possible only by an eternal personal Word or Thought, through the all-penetrating presence of the Divine Spirit. This would give the thought the necessary energy and favor its development.

It is true in the generations of the primary idea of man, taken in its widest sense, that in the course of the developments that which was last came first, and that the first came forth as the last. First, the heavens and the earth were made, and then man appeared afterwards. It was necessary that this should be the order. Man must have a standing place and room for an abode before he made an appearance. So it is everywhere. The lower comes to view before the higher, the body before the soul, the natural before the spiritual: but this is only in appearance, only an outward, historical order. In the real, logical order, the idea is first and paramount,—the first and also the last; and so man, who is the microcosm, precedes in creation the macrocosm, which is only the reflection and extension of his being. In the Icelandic Edda, the All-Father made the immense giant Ymer first, in the general chaos of contending elements; then the gods slew him, and out of his huge body, stretched over many a league, formed the world as it now stands. This myth, if not an inspiration or intuition of truth, may be regarded as an illustration of what has been said above.

We may behold for ourselves the concrete character of God's thoughts everywhere throughout creation, and how they differ from ours in the respect mentioned above. Our mathematics are purely abstract, while God's are concrete, embodied in the system of nature, all of whose parts are ruled by mathematical laws. There He is the absolute geometer. He is also an artist,

a physicist, an astronomer, a chemist, a physiologist, and indeed the greatest of all teachers, with an illustration for His principles in every branch of natural science; and all His systems or treatises are drawn out in living characters in the face of creation. Why, then, should He not have been also the philosopher and metaphysician in the beginning? He, doubtless, was, and that before He became scientist, or proceeded to teach the practical application of scientific principles, as He did in the structure of the human soul, or in the manipulation of the soil of the earth for agricultural purposes. But His system of metaphysics was something concrete, His thoughts energizing realities, concrete generalities, and, at the same time, ever widening their range from the lowest form of organism up to the highest. Here there was no dead level, nor were all things equal. From this point of view we cannot think that He could have created such living things, one after another in naked isolation, but as a rational process. Here we have a right to look for evolution; and here evolution has also its rights. Some parts must be central whilst others must submit to be peripheral. There must be a cap-stone to finish the structure. We look for a generative and also an energizing principle between the Creator and His creatures, which shall unite the two and give harmony and consistency to the entire system. With the evolutionist we believe in evolution also: he is certainly right in maintaining that the cosmos is an evolution, a process; but we differ from him in regard to the starting point. He believes that the whole system of things proceeded from some vital atom; we believe that it logically and truthfully came from something more spiritual, like man, as its *punctum saliens*. The descent of man could not be from below, for this is a contradiction in terms; we ought to write of atoms, plants and animals, rather as descendants from above and not from below; and this, we believe, commends itself as a rational view of the subject.

The times are urgent, and what has been said, if worth nothing else, will, it is hoped, show the necessity of some true system of metaphysics in these materialistic times. If the true lovers of

wisdom do not supply this demand, then it will come, as we have seen, from a materialistic, physical standpoint, and bring in with it the skeptical, agnostic, materialistic, idealistic, atheistic, pantheistic, idolatrous Philistines, who will be upon those of us who wish to walk by faith, and bind us hand and foot. There is need for pure thinkers; and all true thinkers are loudly called on to awake from their slumbers on the lap of a faithless, materialistic Delilah.

We have time here only to thank Prof. Bowne for his book. It is something new in our literature—a departure from the common run of books—earnest and thoughtful, well written, and for its appearance here, in such a country as ours, where books of this character are scarce—*albae aves*—there is no need of any apology.

We could have wished that it had been more constructive and synthetic; and that the psychological part had been more pneumatological, for we think that man is better understood as a spiritual being than one who is merely psychic. Then, too, in a science of being, theology,—that is, the metaphysical part of it at least,—should be included, as Kant rightly maintains. Theologians are sometimes hard pressed, in our skeptical age, and they would all appreciate any help that might come to them from the metaphysical camp. But this is a mere criticism, and does not diminish the value of the book as it stands. We have read it over carefully—some parts over and over again—and we are happy to say that it has benefited us and strengthened us in faith and knowledge.

II.

A POLITICO-ECONOMIC PROBLEM.*

BY HON. J. S. HESS, A.M.

THE subject chosen for this occasion differs somewhat from the themes selected by those who have addressed you on former occasions, but you will hardly question the propriety of the selection when you consider that we are all citizens of that grand republic which announced its debut into the world in that glorious pronunciamiento on the fourth of July, 1776, with the words "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Compare for one moment the condition of the period of our history when these words were proclaimed with that of the present and the mind is scarcely able to comprehend the difference. Then there was equality and democracy, the habits of the people were plain and simple, the houses were comparatively small and unpretentious, the furniture was rude and inexpensive, the dress was simple homespun, and the modes of communication were slow and uncertain. All were obliged to follow the divine injunction, to eat bread in the sweat of the brow. People neither lived in idleness nor reclined in the lap of pleasure. Luxury was unknown, and utter want and misery was absent. The tramp had not been heard of and alms-houses were few and far between. No one was able to lead an easy, luxurious life, but on the other hand no one needed to take thought what to eat on the morrow or wherewithal to be clothed. With advancing prosperity, increase of material resources, countless devices for the division of labor, innumerable

*An Address delivered before the Alumni of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. June, 20th 1883.

labor-saving machines, there should have come more leisure and comfort for all classes and conditions of men. Has such been the case?

Since the establishment of the American republic there has been greater material progress, and a larger increase in the power of producing wealth than is known in any similar period in the world's history. To what have steam and electricity not been applied? Enter our large manufacturing centres and behold the manifold improvements in machinery. When we consider that a single individual with one of these machines can accomplish more in the same period of time than a score or a hundred men could accomplish without it, we naturally conclude that it should in so far have lightened the labor and bettered the condition of the laborer. The railroad has taken the place of the stage-coach and the Conestoga wagon, oil drawn from the soil has superseded the old tallow-dip and the oil of the fish, the reaper has displaced the old-time sickle, the steamship has supplanted the antiquated sailing-vessel, the cotton and woolen factories have done away with the weaver's simple loom and shuttle, the large manufactories of boots and shoes have left the poor cobbler in the cold, the telegraph has annihilated distance and brought the whole world into the closest communication, and the telephone has brought the voices of persons separated by space within hailing distance. Were I to describe the uses to which electricity and steam have been applied, and enter into a partial description of the labor-saving machinery this century has developed, my time would be more than occupied and I would fail to reach the object aimed at in this address. So much has been established by a simple reference to the above facts that the efficiency of labor has been marvellously increased. Has the laborer shared proportionately in the advantages secured by these inventions and improvements? If not, who has?

Behold the railroad and the iron kings, the coal, the oil and the merchant princes, the gold and silver barons of the West. Each of these has enough followers to establish an old-time

principality. Large wealth brings with it political and social power. In order to prevent a vast accumulation of wealth in the hands of one person, the law of primogeniture, as it exists in England, by which the eldest son only inherits, was not recognized in the law of descents in this country. But the abrogation of this law by our early fathers has evidently failed to accomplish the purpose, as can be seen by the millions now concentrated in the hands of the few. The tendency of the times is undoubtedly in the direction of the accumulation of wealth. Is it possible for a man from the simple salary received as a railroad officer to become a millionaire? Is it right that men engaged in the iron and steel industries of the land should, in the course of a few years, accumulate millions beyond the legitimate interest on investments, while in hard times their employes are driven to the verge of starvation? Is it legitimate, from a true politico-economic standpoint, for coal operators to combine to advance or keep up the price of coal? Is there not a defect in the statutes of the land which allow an interference of such a kind with the laws of supply and demand? Can it be, as is frequently asserted, in the interest of the employes?

The tendency of the times is undoubtedly to concentrate wealth in the hands of the few. Take the mercantile business of Philadelphia. Five years ago with a population more than a hundred thousand less, the mercantile appraisalment of Philadelphia showed about four hundred more dealers in merchandize than the appraisalment of last year. Is this a healthy growth? A larger population and fewer independent business men. The immense mercantile establishments of Philadelphia have driven the smaller stores out of existence. It is well worthy of the serious consideration of thinking men whether it is advantageous to a free republic to see the business of the country concentrated in the hands of the few, while the many become mere vassals and dependents. Everything is at present conducted on a large scale. What effect will this have upon our political future? If these vast accumulations are an ab-

normal growth they require the earliest possible attention. If they necessarily accompany the material progress of the world, then again the question demands consideration, and statesmen should devise a method by which the multitude may share in this advance, and by which their lives may cease to be a sharp struggle for existence, with the barest sustenance for a reward.

Has not combination had a great deal to do with the enormous accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few? Every reader of the news of the day in Pennsylvania is familiar with the history of the combination of the Standard Oil Company with the railroad companies by which the few were enriched and the many impoverished. This was such a glaring combination, and so far-reaching in its results that the Standard Oil Monopoly has become a by-word in Pennsylvania. But in our execration of this single monopoly are we not unmindful, yea altogether forgetful of the many rings and combinations which have taken possession of all the great enterprises of our country, by which the few have been enriched at the expense of the many? The people of America are tyrannized more by corporations and above all by the rings that manage corporations, than the masses in Europe are tyrannized politically by their rulers. When will we come to realize that all business on a large scale is so conducted as to divert the profits from the many to the few? If the inner history of the various productive enterprises of the country was written, it would be found that interest must be paid, and profits are demanded for millions of dollars that were never invested, but were mere paper issues, based upon false capitalization, by which a few projectors were benefited and the masses robbed. Too many public enterprises have been fostered by legislation, originally for a beneficent purpose, but the consequence has invariably been that certain individuals realized millions of dollars at the expense of the public. Then again we find that operators on a large scale have sacrificed the interests of the corporations they were elected to guard and protect, for the advancement of their private interests. All these are evils co-existent with corporate power that will bring punishment in due course of

time, and the country that allows such wrongs to be perpetrated *ad libitum* must in the end suffer the inevitable penalty. State legislatures have too often been made powerless and ineffective by the corruption funds of monster monopolies.

What has the accumulation of wealth by the few brought in its train? A style of living more princely than that of the crowned heads of Europe. According to the statement of a leading New York journal the cost of living stylishly, in a fashionable quarter of New York city, is fifty thousand dollars per annum. Is it right that the earnings of one hundred and fifty to two hundred producers should be required to support a family of half a dozen persons—persons who are but too often non-producers? The excess required by these is taken from the producers, and do not the producers suffer in consequence? Is it to be wondered at when it requires the labor of one hundred and fifty to two hundred persons to support one family, that there is developed, by the side of the greatest material prosperity, the most abject poverty? What follows this style of living, based upon the concentration of wealth already described? It produces caste and aristocracy, it degrades labor, and is calculated to build up a class of people not in harmony with the principles of a free and independent republic. Enter our large cities to-day and see the gorgeous livery of the servants, the heraldic insignia and coats-of-arms on the carriages of these people, and ask yourselves whether they are indicative of republican simplicity, or whether those thus reared and educated are inspired with love for a republican form of government. What becomes of republican simplicity when Lord Lorne of England confessed that, never, even amid royal trappings, had he seen so gorgeous an entertainment as that which welcomed and honored him in the White House. The English people are not slow to see the aristocratic tendency of our people. It was cabled from London not long since, as though it were a matter of public import and of international significance, that a matrimonial alliance had been arranged between young Mr. Northcote, a son of Sir Stafford, and Miss Edith Fish, a

daughter of the former Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish. Our larger cities contain journals in which the parties, the social gatherings and the general movements of these families are as fully reported in all their details as similar events in the court journals of the European capitals. Twenty-five years ago the observer of current events was not called upon to record such indications of aristocracy. That there are those among us who believe in aristocracy was shown some years ago by the establishment of a newspaper in New York, entitled "The Imperialist," which, however, was short-lived, because it was born before its time. But straws indicate which way the wind blows. The aristocratic spirit which inspired the birth of "The Imperialist" is not dead but slumbers until such time when, if wise statesmanship does not prevent it, the country shall be ripe for the abandonment of the principles of Washington, Madison and Jefferson.

Our millionaires are erecting palatial mansions superior to the residences of the kings and princes of Europe. Their displays surpass those of the court of Louis XIV of France. The reader of history knows how soon that dynasty was brought to an end by the mob that had been ground down by taxation to furnish means for the resplendent gaiety of that licentious court. Our corporation kings would do well not to exasperate a hungry mob, whose bread they advance by an extra five cents of freight. Millionaires wasting their substance on gaieties on the one hand, and paupers suffering and taunted by the display of the wealthy on the other do not make a strong republican government. The great party of Vanderbilt which required months of preparation is fresh in your memories. The cost of it, exclusive of the expenses of those attending it, is said to have been a hundred thousand dollars. Whom did they personate? Among others, the royal personages of the most extravagant and licentious periods in the world's history. Did the party furnish rational enjoyment and real recreation, or was it not rather a vain display of vulgar riches, followed the next day by heart-aches and headaches? The simplicity of revolutionary days is de-

spised among such, and extravagance has come to take the place of economy. While millionaires are revelling in luxury and pleasure, what is the condition of the laborer? He is growing more restive and dissatisfied.

Who of you fails to recall the great strikes of 1877? The very foundations of our republic were shaken by them as by an earthquake. They arose and spent their fury chiefly against the railroads, those corporations which were fostered and encouraged by legislation until they stand forth to-day as the most gigantic monopolies of modern times, to be used by certain parties for their personal aggrandizement at the expense of the injured public. There must be something radically defective in a system which admits of such a universal outbreak. There are mutterings in the air again of no uncertain sound. The reasons assigned by some at that time for the hard times, such as the want of a sufficient amount of legal tender, free trade agitation, high protective tariff and shrinkage in values, are not sufficient to explain the outburst and fury of the labor element in all the manufacturing centers of the country. There must be a deeper cause than either of those mentioned. The course then pursued by those engaged in the strikes, while disastrous to railroads and manufacturers, was not advantageous to the laborer. But as the drowning man will catch at a straw, so the suffering laborer will reach forth towards what seems to him at the time the most serviceable means of attaining his end. The same age that developed the grand inventions already alluded to, has also produced nitro-glycerine and dynamite, instruments which are immensely destructive in the hands of a maddened crowd. A journal of respectability, the "Home Journal" of New York, has lately said that "dynamite might be employed as a means of elevating the condition of the poor and oppressed, by enabling the humblest and most obscure to blow up or kill at trifling expense anybody who stands in the way of his happiness." This is dangerous doctrine to preach, for the mad crowd is an unsafe judge, and the innocent will be made to suffer with the guilty. But alas! when a wrong has

been committed the punishment will come, and the Nemesis of history will execute the penalty of blood. She will not question the right or the law. When the masses are ground down and reduced to poverty, the wealthy are deprived of protection. When the laborers in our manufacturing centres once become homeless and hopeless, society is endangered and order cannot be maintained. It will not do for our monopolists to cry for cheap labor. Compare the wages of the laborers with the salaries paid by railroads and the larger industries. When times grow harder and profits grow less, are the salaries decreased with the wages of the common laborers? Compare the wages of laborers and the salaries of the officials at the present time with those in the most flourishing times. While you will find the average wages lower you will see that the salaries are higher. Such a system is not equitable and should arbitration, which has been legalized by statute in our state, become more universal for the adjustment of difficulties, attention should be called to this injustice. It is to be hoped that arbitration will secure the utmost that its most ardent advocates hope for. The price of labor must be maintained since nothing is more destructive to the peace and good order of society than cheap labor in the service of corporations, that are paying excessive salaries to their officers, and large dividends upon watered stock.

In the East the millionaires and heads of corporate powers have not sought political preferment. They have felt content with the purchase of legislative privileges. But in the Western states the bonanza kings have, through their wealth, secured seats in the Senate of the United States. The names of Jones, Tabor, Fair and Mackay, will suffice to show that it was wealth rather than worth that secured them Senatorial honors. The ease with which some of these have broken the matrimonial bond shows a laxity of morals that cannot but prove deleterious to the future of the American republic. Such debauchery must bring with it the destruction of public morals. These men are as bad as the nobles of the worst period in the history of the Ro-

man Emperors. They should never have been elevated to seats in the Senate of the United States, and it speaks badly for the Western part of the United States, when men who have no character to recommend them, but are utterly dependent upon the base millions they possess, and who outrage the sense of right and honor by ruthlessly breaking their marital vows, and seeking to gild the broken ties with gold, are called to sit in the highest legislative body of this great republic. These are not the men who can frame wise and beneficent laws—laws that will be alike beneficial to rich and poor—capitalist and laborer.

Brute force was able in times gone by to keep down the laborer, but it will not do under a republic; and unless we are willing to give up our glorious birthright, secured to us by the sacrifices of our noble ancestors, and confirmed by the blood of those who cemented the union of the states, this problem must be solved and the paradox removed that abject poverty comes with material growth. Unless labor is dignified and the undue accumulation of wealth is checked, it is to be feared that the words of John Adams were but too true when he said:—

“A nobility must and will exist. Descent from certain parents and inheritance of certain houses, lands and other visible objects will eternally have such an influence over the affections and imaginations of the people as no arts and institutions can control. Time will come, that these circumstances will have more influence over great numbers of minds than any consideration of virtue and talents.”

The influence of the rapid growth of wealth has been such that men have come to adopt the maxim “Get money honestly if you can, but at any rate get money.” This principle developed the Credit Mobilier scandal and the doctrine of putting money where it will do the most good. The Tweed ring was an outgrowth of the desire to obtain money without labor. The Philadelphia rings, the celebrated whiskey ring, the star route scandal are all products of the same growth. There is abroad a spirit of unrest and anxiety for wealth, grounded in the general fact that wealth is distributed so unequally and

that worth without wealth receives but little recognition. The prosperity of the country and the perpetuity of the republic rest upon an equitable division of wealth. It must and will produce restiveness when the non-producer lives at ease and revels in luxury, while the producer has scarcely the wherewithal to keep body and soul together. Herein lies the danger to society. Behold as an illustration the condition of Mexico, where the inequitable distribution of wealth has brought with it constant restlessness and anarchy.

Herein lies the danger to our institutions from French communism, German socialism, Russian nihilism and Irish agrarianism, all tending in the same direction. When men see that people possess millions not obtained by labor or purchase, but in too many cases traceable to fraud, speculation, corporate advantages or unjust discrimination, they lose the incentive to labor and will eventually seek like the Russian nihilist, to subvert existing institutions, like the Irish agrarian to divide the land, like the French communist to have all property in common, or to have daily re-distribution like the intemperate German revolutionist of 1848 who desired an equal division of all goods and property and upon being told that the beer brewer would soon have more than he, replied, then divide again.

The vast numbers of immigrants that come upon our shores annually add another danger to the problem. As long as millions of acres called for occupants, these immigrants could be easily amalgamated, but as the population grows denser and hosts of those who come belong to the so-called dangerous classes of society they only add to the number of those who are already muttering and murmuring. In less than ten years there have been added to our population about five and a half millions of foreigners, or about one tenth of the whole population. Among these are socialists of the Herr Most order who come to us with their infamous doctrines and bring apples of discord into the country. They are dangerous to any community because they would wipe out all moral and social laws,

break down civilization and transplant us into a state of barbarism. It is a grave question whether such a large influx, continuously going on, could at best be united harmoniously with our people, and be of mutual benefit, they to our country and the country to them, but when they come to add only to the number of those already discontented they become positively dangerous.

In this connexion the question naturally arises who are the dangerous classes? Are the dangerous classes restricted to the proletariat, or may we look elsewhere for dangerous classes of society? The thief is unquestionably a dangerous character, but is he who enters my house and steals my household goods or property more a thief than the man who under cover of law robs a whole community? The railroad officers who use their official position to advance their private interests at the expense of the innocent stockholders or of the public must certainly be numbered among the dangerous classes. When these words are used we are but too prone to think at once of those who are on the lowest rungs of the social ladder. The men who produce corners in wheat, corn, oil or any of the necessities of life belong to the dangerous classes, even though their method of theft is of a genteel character. They belong to the non-producing class and like the thieving barons on the Rhine during the mediæval ages, they live sumptuously upon the goods abstracted from the producing class. When we come therefore to study the intricate problems of modern society it is sometimes difficult to attain the truth. The poor man who by his daily labor assists in creating wealth, without enjoying it, is deserving of our heart-felt sympathy, while the man who enjoys wealth without having assisted one iota in its creation is deserving of no regard, even though he be clothed in purple and fine linen and be ever so shrewd in the manipulation of the stock market. The latter is a society cormorant who adds nothing to the advancement of society or the wealth of the world. He is not even as deserving of notice as the feeble-minded objects of charity, who in their weakness cannot assist in wealth-creation.

The producing classes, in order to be happy and prosperous need above all things low taxes and small governmental expenses, because that will assist in securing to them a full recompense for their labor. The consumer eventually pays all the taxes and the lower the taxes the easier will be the burdens of the government upon the shoulders of the poor who always out-number the wealthy. Low taxes can only be secured by the reduction of governmental expenses to the lowest point, and by the surrender of the largest number of so-called charities into the hands of the wealthy.

An honest and an economical administration of the government is demanded by the exigencies of the times. The expenses of governmental machinery, state and national have grown larger from year to year. There is this peculiarity about officials and their salaries, that the officials are rarely reduced in number, and the salaries rarely decreased in amount. It is the interest of the producer to see the number of officials decreased as far as the efficient performance of the public business will allow, and, their salaries placed on a par with salaries for like services in any other sphere. In that way only can we expect to obtain an improved public service and to see a reduction of the amount of money, running into millions, now spent by political parties to carry an election. If the taxes are reduced and the governmental expenses decreased, it must follow as a corollary that wages, even though not higher, will have a greater purchasable value, and the condition of the laborer will thereby be ameliorated.

Any one who observed the utter recklessness, and the undue haste with which the Senate of Pennsylvania appropriated millions of dollars to the various charitable institutions of the state, private and public, without examination into the character of the institutions, their manner of conducting business, or the amounts paid out for salaries, must have sympathized deeply with the pockets of the poor tax-payers. The charitable institutions should be taken in charge of by the state, only in so far as the private charity of the wealthy fails to take proper care

of the necessities of the deserving. No more money should be abstracted by taxation from the producers, than is absolutely required, since the money thus appropriated is spent upon non-producers, and therefore adds nothing to the common stock. The wealthy owe it to society to relieve the poor from taxation for the relief of the helpless non-producing members of society. If we had more millionaires of the character of Peabody, Packer, and Cooper, less would be heard of the conflict of capital and labor. The name of Packer is a household word in the Lehigh Valley, and he will be known by the common people of future generations more through the millions he contributed towards the establishment of Lehigh University as an institution free to all, and the endowment of St. Luke's Hospital in Bethlehem, than as the wealthy coal operator and the great railroad president. The millionaires who would erect to their memories monuments more enduring than granite or marble, should spend part of their wealth in the amelioration of the lower strata of society, the establishment of free universities, hospitals, and orphan asylums, as a slight recompense to those who, by their sweat and toil have enabled them to amass colossal fortunes.

The careful observer of the times cannot fail to see that there are grave and momentous problems rising beyond the party questions of the day, which demand the earnest attention of the wisest and most profound thinkers of the age. The young man, well disciplined by a full course of classical training, comes to the task well fitted by his knowledge of the history of the past, and by his acquaintance with the best thinkers of the world. He should not pass by these problems heedlessly. He comes from a contemplation of the struggles of all the nations of the world in a proper frame of mind to study the problem of the age, unmoved by the mad passions of the hour, and deaf to the noises of mere popular clamor. The politico-economic problem of the period is pressed upon him for solution. The text-books on political economy do not solve the problem for him. He cannot accept the mere *ipse dixit* of any political

economist as a truism. He must try their so-called laws by the facts and the circumstances of the present, guided by his knowledge of the problems solved by past generations. This period in the history of the civilization of the world, brings with it new questions and new problems for our consideration. The coward alone will shrink from the contemplation of the great problem on account of the intricacies of modern social life. This great age of material progress, with which none in the world's history will bear a comparison, calls for independent thinkers and true statesmen. Ward politicians, and pot-house workers can be found in abundance everywhere. But they are not wanted in the forum nor in the legislative hall.

The great question that presses upon us for solution, is how to remedy the evil, that with all our great material progress, the position of the individual worker has not been improved. The underlying theme of our whole discourse, and a fact that must be patent to every one that has given the subject consideration, is that the greater the material wealth, the more abject proportionately the poverty of the masses. Every improvement in productive machinery has brought with it a greater division of labor. With this division and sub-division comes a contraction of the mental capacity of the operatives, because the varied faculties of the mind are not called into requisition. The corrective for this evil is to afford means for the development of the minds of those who on account of improved machinery are limited in thought and action by their daily labor. They must be allowed more leisure and more rational recreation. They should have museums, containing collections of all that is grand and noble in art, and libraries free of access to them as the air they breathe, free lectures upon subjects of interest, and inducements should be offered them to read, study, and improve their minds, thereby advancing their social position in life.

For the humanitarian it is a sad thought that notwithstanding the vast improvements in labor-saving machinery, the progress of science, the advance of intelligence, the universality of education, the steady progress of exchange, the advantages of instant communication, and the increased productive power of

the present over the past, the laborer does not share equally in the advantages which modern progress affords. The individual operative can only share in the advantages, by the reduction of the hours of labor, the rational enjoyment of his leisure, and adequate means for the improvement of his mind, which otherwise becomes dwarfed by being subjected in the dull tread of routine, through labor-saving devices, to the performance of but an infinitesimal part of work.

True statesmanship seeks the advancement of those classes of people who constitute the bone and sinew of the land. The wealthy can well take care of their own interests, and do not need the fostering care of legislation, but if they understand their own best interests, they will seek to ameliorate the condition of the laborer as their own best protection against the false teachings of those who would undermine the rights of property and array the poor against the rich.

The greatest danger to our free institutions is the division of our people into two great classes, the rich and the poor. It was Macaulay, I think, who said that the American republic could only stand so long as it remained an exclusively agricultural country, and that caste and aristocracy would appear with the establishment of great manufactures. It is the part of American statesmen who desire to see this republic stand as a government of the people, by the people and for the people, to preserve a true equilibrium, and never allow a gulf to spring up between the two classes; that the rich become the envy of the poor and the poor the mere dependents of the rich.

One great safeguard is the permanent division of the land into small possessions. It is dangerous to our institutions to have large farms, consisting of thousands of acres of land, fall into the possession of single individuals. Immense tracts in the West have, I am sorry to say, been already bought up by American capitalists and English landholders. The evil of such a condition is plainly seen in Ireland, where the soil is fertile enough to support a larger number of people than inhabit the island at present, but as the fatness of the land is

taken out of the country, away from the producers, to pay the exorbitant rents and demands of the landholders in England, who are non-producers, the poor Irish peasants are frequently driven to the verge of starvation. We should learn this lesson before it is too late. We want more homesteads for our people. The patriotic American citizen never wishes to see our land divided into large baronial estates, making a marked line of division between the poor laborer and the rich owner of the land. If such a time should ever come, which God forbid, that one class would be in possession of the land and the other of the votes, there would be such a disturbance of the social system, such an utter refutation of the accepted principles of political economy as would surprise the world. The propositions of Kearney and others of his ilk would be incorporated in legislation. It was well said in a late number of "The New York Tribune": "The small farmer has been the great safeguard of our civilization. If we have never had any serious and prolonged conflicts between labor and capital; if the people have always been order-loving, just and in the best sense conservative; if we have been able to receive millions of the poor and discontented from foreign countries and convert them without the least friction into useful and thrifty citizens, it is because we have made it our national policy to give every man who wants it a stake in the country. The typical American farmer is laborer and capitalist at once; and whenever the two great forces of society are thus united there must be prosperity and peace."

As the prosperity of our country is dependent upon the equitable division of wealth, there must be such a participation of the workmen about our manufacturing centres in the profits of the business as will afford them means to buy and hold homes of their own. Nothing contributes so much towards making a contented conservative citizen as the possession of a home. Nothing is so well calculated to break down the barriers between the rich and the poor as the encouragement, by the manufacturers, of their men to purchase and obtain homes for

themselves and their children. Nothing on the other hand tends more towards the erection of a wall between the rich and the poor than the driving of poor workmen into low tenement houses, where they are huddled together in masses, deprived of all the comforts of life. No wonder that a spirit of restiveness and discontentment rises up among such. Should they have dear little ones whom they love so tenderly, as those in more favored circumstances love their children, what must be the feelings of the poor occupants of these miserable abodes, when they see the children of the wealthy enjoying luxuries, while to their own are denied the common necessities of life.

Our only safeguard is the equality of opportunity and this must be afforded to the poor for the welfare of all. It can only be preserved by keeping down caste, preventing class privileges, upholding the purity of elections, preventing wealthy monopolists from buying legislatures and suborning courts, and by the election to our legislative halls of men who are neither monopolists nor demagogues, but who have the real interests of the whole country and all classes at heart. In conclusion it may be said that our social prosperity and our political future as a free and independent republic are dependent upon an equitable division of property, and how best to preserve such equality is the politico-economic problem for our statesmen to solve.

III.

MORALITY IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY REV. GEORGE F. MULL.

IN the June number of the *Atlantic Monthly* there appeared an article, with the above title, over the signature of Oliver Johnson. In many respects the article is a remarkable one, and likely to attract wide attention, on account of the apparent boldness with which the writer advocates certain principles which are only too likely to find acceptance with the great mass of unthinking people. And the fact that the writer is careful to say, "I write not in the interest of skepticism, but as one who cherishes a profound belief in God and in Christianity as taught by Jesus Himself," only serves to hide the claw under a velvet cushion, and makes the argument all the more a delusion and a snare.

But let us get at a fair statement of the writer's position, as we have been impressed thereby. He acknowledges, in fair and strong language, the necessity of pure moral instruction in the public schools; but this moral instruction must be totally free from every appearance of religious or Christian instruction; he says, the State has no right to maintain a system of education in which any religious morality whatsoever shall be taught; the only morality which the State has the right or capacity to teach, is a purely speculative or philosophical morality,—a cultivation of the "moral sentiments" (Spencer), in order that the quality of the State's citizenship may not deteriorate and so the Republic be endangered; and, then, to further the teaching of such morality, to devise some means of overcoming the difficulties in the way of establishing some uniform

system of moral instruction for the public schools on the broad basis of nature, the writer calls upon all true friends of the schools to arouse themselves and take ground on which they may consistently stand and cooperate; and, finally, he allows himself to hope that "religious men, without distinction of sect, will ere long abandon as unreasonable the attempt to make the public school an agent for religious propagandism, and unite with their fellow-citizens of every class in an effort to make it as efficient in the field of morals as in that of science."

Now we submit that Mr. Johnson might find a great many well-intentioned persons to agree with him in his belief, that the moral nature of children could, in some way, be cultivated without any reference to Christianity or religion of any kind for the purposes of citizenship of passable sort, but, when he advocates the exclusion of all religious training from the public schools of the land, he enters the threshold of our homes, the domain where fathers and mothers are wont to watch over their children with a somewhat more tender solicitude than they could command simply as fit subjects for citizenship of the State. And here, we do believe, Mr. Johnson might have some difficulty in attaching to himself any very great following among the good people, for there is still a very widespread and somewhat old-fashioned belief abroad in the land, that Christianity involves morality in a very real sense, and that a good Christian makes a good citizen.

We are prepared to say that there is no such thing as practical morality unless it be rooted and grounded in the religious feeling of our human nature. And such religious feeling is planted in every human breast; "we know, and it is our pride to know, that man is, by his constitution, a religious animal; that atheism is against, not only our reason, but our instincts; and that it cannot prevail long."* This needs no proof. The religious instinct of humanity is so universal that we know of no people that is without its religious system, however simple and rude it be. "Amidst the concurrent testimony of political and

* Burke: Works of, Vol. III. p. 351.

philosophical writers among the Pagans, in the most absolute state of democratic freedom, the sentiments of Plutarch are too remarkable to be omitted. After reciting that the first and greatest care of the legislators of Rome, Athens, Lacedæmon, and Greece in general, was, by instituting solemn supplications and forms of oaths, to inspire them with a sense of the favor or displeasure of heaven, that learned historian declares, that we have met with towns unfortified, illiterate, and without the convenience of habitations, but a people wholly without religion no traveler hath yet seen; and a city might as well be erected in the air as a state be made to unite where no divine worship is attended. Religion, he terms the cement of civil union and the essential support of legislation." It is in this deep under-current of humanity that we must look for the true spring of moral action. Where there is no religion, no sense of the Infinite, no sense of the spiritual background of our earthly existence, there can be no sense of responsibility, no proper room for ethical development. *

But we are prepared to go a step further, and say, that, aside from the *Christian* religion, there can be, for us and for our age, as also for all peoples and all times, no practical morality of pure and lasting character. To say that there can be a practical morality, suitable to the needs of our daily life, without the Christian religion, is to say that the Christian religion itself is unnecessary and might as well be dispensed with. Who is prepared to do this? And yet we ask, in all seriousness, if virtue can be developed and made to blossom into the fruit of good and noble deeds, if character can be unfolded and equipped for life's toilsome battle, if settled habits of industry, honesty, sobriety can be formed, if the soul can be fitted for immortality,—and if it cannot be so fitted you deny the end of human existence entirely,—by the various means and appliances of a philosophical system of morals, of what avail is the Christian

* "Morality without religion is only a kind of dead reckoning—an endeavor to find our place on a cloudy sea by measuring the distance we have run, but without any observation of the heavenly bodies."—Longfellow.

religion at all? Any attempt, therefore, to exclude the Christian religion from any system devised for the instruction of the young, is a direct blow at Christianity itself.

We have always thought that the scheme of salvation as presented in the gospel of Jesus Christ was sufficient for our human life in its entirety; that it embraced within its ample folds every attribute and function of our being,—the will, the intellect, the emotional nature; that it included every period of our life from infancy to old age, and every possible relation that might be formed during our sojourn here; and that it rounded off our whole earthly existence with the assurance of a blessed immortality beyond the grave. If, however, Christianity does not do this,—if Mr. Spencer's "moral sentiments" are outside of its range and quite beyond its influence,—then, I confess, it might be necessary for every moral sentient being to go to some select and approved school of scientific morals, not overlooking the advantage of the popular "fourteen weeks' course," before he could expect to present himself as morally fit for the reception of the Christian religion! But any one can see that this would leave Christianity defective in a very important aspect, and consequently inadequate to our human needs. Was not this the cry of Mr. Thomas Paine ("Age of Reason")? "Let us devise means," he exclaims, "to establish schools of instruction, that we may banish the ignorance that the ancient regime of kings and priests has spread among the people. Let us propagate morality, unfettered by superstition," or religion, which is what he meant.* Infidelity might, perhaps show itself in a worse form, but it could not well show itself in a more dangerous and insidious form than just in this proposition to attempt the teaching of morality to the young without the aid of Christianity, and without the hallowing influences flowing from the contemplation of the spotless Lamb of God.

* Daniel Webster. Speech in Girard Will Case, Supreme Court, February 20, 1844. We owe much, for the inspiration of our thought, to this magnificent plea of the great-minded Webster, and make this general acknowledgment here, with special ones in place.

The Christian world has at all times held that the Christian religion is the only sure and solid foundation for the morality of the people. It is the firm basis of our civilization, the great bulwark of the nations, the prop and stay of governments, and the saving element in the movement of the world's history. We hold, therefore, steadily to that interpretation of Christianity which insists upon the moral content of religion as distinguished from its external ceremonies and abstract dogmas. These are invalid excepting as they make men better—determine their conduct. That a person can be a Christian, and at the same time immoral, is inconceivable to our mind. The two cannot be separated. Christianity includes morality just as really as music includes the harmony of sound, and morality without Christianity would be just about as meaningless and insubstantial as mere sound without the harmony of music. This is so unmistakably true that we find it, in principle, most clearly enunciated in the best forms of pagan philosophy, where the human reason, unaided by divine revelation, so nobly struggled to effect its own emancipation, and yet, with all its wondrous powers and magnificent attainments, fell short of the light of freedom which is in the Absolute Truth. Plato's remarkable conclusion in this respect may well be regarded as an adumbration of the true rule for human conduct as revealed in the Divine Word. We cite a few passages: "*Socrates*. 'If, then, you wish public measures to be right and noble, *virtue* must be given by you to the citizens.' *Alcibiades*. 'How could any one deny that?' *Socrates*. '*Virtue*, therefore, is that which is to be first possessed, both by you and by every other person who would have direction and care, not only for himself and things dear to himself, but for the state, and things dear to the state.' *Alcibiades*. 'You speak truly.' *Socrates*. 'To act justly and wisely (both you and the state), YOU MUST ACT ACCORDING TO THE WILL OF GOD.' *Alcibiades*. 'It is so.'"^{*} Cicero comes to a similar conclusion: "The citizens must, from

^{*}Translation of I Alcibiades, xxx, C, standing as a motto in the pamphlet edition of Webster's speech already referred to.

the very beginning, be convinced of this, that the gods are the lords and moderators of all things."*

Without any pretence at philosophical or logical proof, we think we may safely assume that Christianity is an absolute necessity of the human race, that it presents the purest system of morals, and therefore the only one to be desired, that it is "the firmest auxiliary and only staple support of all human laws." No government of any civilized country has failed to recognize this, but, on the contrary, has done all it could to foster and promote its growth.

The interest which the State, throughout the civilized portion of the globe, manifests in the education of its people, is only a part of that general policy which seeks the best means for its own preservation, and for the maintenance and perpetuation of its institutions. Education is but the handmaid of Christianity—the means to a glorious end. The State is, therefore, pretty generally regarded as acting entirely within its own proper sphere when it provides for the education of the young by the establishment of free common schools. But it is also pretty generally conceded that mere secular knowledge is not enough even for the purposes of good citizenship; that besides the intellectual training, there must be also a certain moral discipline,—an education tending to the development and establishment of character. It is not enough that the intelligence be awakened, and by proper discipline be enabled to apprehend the truth as revealed in the order of the natural world around us, or in the various forms of reason as these confront us in the world of letters and science; the will must be reached, and in some way made to apprehend the good, and thus trained in the exercise of right and duty. Even "Herbert Spencer," says Mr.

*Sic igitur hoc jam a principio persuasum civibus, dominos esse omnium rerum ac moderatores deos eaque, quæ gerantur, eorum geri ditione, ac numine eosdemque optime de genere hominum mereri et qualis quisque sit, quid agat, quid in se admittat, qua mente, qua pietate colat religiones, intueri; piorumque et impiorum habere rationem. His enim rebus imbutæ mentes haud sane abhorrebunt ab utili et a vera sententia. Cicero. De Leg., II. 7.

Johnson, "has lattely spoken of 'the universal delusion about education as a panacea for political evils,' and declared that the fitting of men for free institutions, 'is essentially a question of character, and only in a secondary degree a question of knowledge;' and he adds that 'not lack of information, but lack of certain moral sentiments is the root of the evil.'" No one of ordinary intelligence will refuse to assent to the general truth contained in these words. Character takes precedence over mere knowledge. Morality is more useful among the forces of human society, and in the shaping of the world's history, than mere scientific attainments and technical learning. If then, the State has the right to educate at all, it has the right, nay more, is bound to educate the heart, the affections, the conscience, the will, no less than the intellect and the analytical reason. No system of education can be true to its own proper end and purpose without recognizing this as the ruling idea in its practice. As a matter of fact, liberal culture, the highest form of education, knows no such thing as the separation of the ethical from the intellectual; the two flow necessarily together, complementing each other, and helping to make the man spiritually complete. In a very profound sense, there is scarcely less morality in the intellectual perception of the truth, than in the ethical realization of the right and good. Man's completest education consists in the completest development of his physical, mental and spiritual attributes. Undue stress dare not be laid upon the one to the neglect of the rest; otherwise a fragmentary and one-sided development would ensue, destroying in so far, the man's capacity to actualize the idea of his creation. Education to be of any real, practical value, must help a man to solve the problem of his own life, to realize the purpose of his own existence, to unfold the thought of the divine mind as revealed in his own creation, to reflect in his own person the image of his Creator. Of course no one would demand this much of the public schools maintained by the State, although the State must ever be profoundly interested in allowing full and free course to any and every educational

movement having this high purpose in view. But we think we have a right to demand, that as far as the public schools go in the education of the young, they shall be as complete and perfect as possible; although necessarily rudimentary and common, they should be in perfect harmony with the true idea of liberal culture. The State must see to it, that the instruction imparted in its schools be not one-sided and fragmentary, that it consist not merely in the conning of rules, and tables, and facts, in the pernicious cramming of text-book knowledge, but that the spiritual nature of the pupils be most tenderly cared for, and the profound and far-reaching interests of the human soul be regarded with some appreciable sense of the responsibility involved.

How shall the public schools meet this demand? How shall they become "as efficient in the field of morals as in that of science?" How shall they proceed in this essential feature of their work—the formation and up-building of character? Here is the very kernel of the problem before us, as Mr. Johnson says, and it is indeed a formidable one, and, as we are inclined to think, utterly insoluble when viewed from his stand-point. For, we repeat, there is no possibility of teaching a sound morality excepting on the basis of the Christian religion, and for the one all-sufficient reason that all the great questions of our life, involving all ethical principles of universal application, such as right, duty, and human responsibility, can only be properly understood under the luminous word of divine revelation. Shall we, then, contend for the teaching of the Christian system of morals in the public schools? We unhesitatingly say, yes. If we believe that Christianity furnishes the best system of morals for our daily life, for the family and human society in general,—if we believe (and the history of the world proves it), that the Christian religion is the most potent moral factor of the universe, upholding free governments, when all other forces, philosophy, science, diplomacy, the human reason even though enthroned, miserably failed,—if we believe that God moves in human history, is revealed in Christ as the type and

pattern of perfect manhood, as the living embodiment of all that is pure, and true, and right, and good, the one ever-living, unchanging example for all men to follow,—if we believe this in our hearts, can we assign any good reason why it should not be taught in some suitable form in our public schools? If Christianity makes the best men, and the best men make the best citizens, can any good reason be assigned why Christianity should not constitute an important element of the instruction to be imparted in schools confessedly established in the interest of good citizenship?

In the first place it is objected that a Republican state, "recognizing the perfect equality of citizens and sects in all things pertaining to religion, is incapacitated for religious teaching, in whatever form." To a certain extent this is true, but in a very profound sense religious tolerance means the deepest possible concern, on the part of the State, for the growth and propagation of religious ideas, for it is the height of political wisdom to enshrine in the hearts and feelings of the people that which is after all the true and unfailing source of strength in a free government. Granting, however, that the State has no right to interfere with the people's freedom in matters religious, has it any more right to interfere with their freedom in matters moral? Is the standard of morality in any system that might be constructed outside of Christianity likely to be so uniform as to be acceptable to all men? Evolved from the human reason, aided by human experience only, would not such a system be as variable, and fractional, and sectional as anything that could be devised? Being of human invention, confined to the finite order of things, it would necessarily partake of the changing and unstable nature of all things human and finite. We may be sure that the State would find at least as much difficulty in deciding upon a system of philosophical morality sufficiently catholic in spirit to commend itself to all shades of thought and all classes of people, as in the formal recognition of the system of Christian morality as this is already in successful operation in every Christian family of the civilized world.

Moreover we apprehend that the State would not have to strain its legitimate powers very far in summoning the Christian religion to its aid for the proper education of its people. Although the government, with true political wisdom, recognizes no ecclesiastical establishment as part of its functions, yet the Christian religion, "the authority of God, His revealed will, and the influence of the teaching of the ministers of Christianity," is none the less "the only conservative principle by which the State and society are kept together." In a thousand ways is this shown in the practical operations of our government, in cases involving its absolute dependence on the religious sentiments of the people. Upon this subject, Mr. Johnson says: "The oath (or affirmation) required of the President and of members of Congress and the State legislatures is purely secular, containing no recognition of a Supreme Being;" he then cites from the treaty made with Tripoli in 1796, the following declaration: "As the government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion; as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity of Mussulmans, * * * * it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries." This treaty, framed under the direction of Washington, was ratified by the Senate, without objection, so far as appears, from any quarter, and is now a part of the supreme law of the land, by which 'the judges in every State are bound, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.'" The purpose the writer evidently has in view by citing the above passages from the constitution and the treaty with Tripoli is so delusive, and the construction put upon them so misleading, that we have been at considerable pains in establishing by unimpeachable authority what we believe to be the correct interpretation of these matters. We fear that here too there may be some danger of halting in "the letter that killeth and not appreciating the spirit that maketh alive," just as there is, in Mr. Johnson's mind, when he speaks about

"the last despairing cry of religious bigotry" and "the feeble wail of a moribund sacerdotalism" as thus halting. First in reference to an oath. Chief Justice Story uses the following significant language in reference to the Presidential oath of office. "Let it not be deemed a vain or idle form. In all these things, God will bring us into judgment. A President, who shall dare to violate the obligation of his solemn oath or affirmation of office, may escape human censure, nay, may even receive applause from the giddy multitude. But he will be compelled to learn, that there is a watchful Providence, that cannot be deceived; and a righteous Being, the searcher of all hearts, who will render unto all men according to their deserts. Considerations of this sort will necessarily make a conscientious man more scrupulous in the discharge of his duty; and will even make a man of looser principles pause, when he is about to enter upon a deliberate violation of his official oath."* Mr. Gladstone, in his recent masterly speech in the celebrated Bradlaugh controversy, says, if there is to be any test at all, it should be a test of a well ascertained theism, "not a mere abstract idea dwelling in the air and in the clouds, but a practical recognition of divine government and power" to which men were to account for every thought and word.† Daniel Webster, in the speech already referred to, says: "An oath as it exists at present in our courts of law, is founded on a degree of consciousness that there is a Power above us that will reward our virtues and punish our vices. We all know that the doctrine of the English law is, that in the case of every person who enters court as a witness, be he Christian or Hindoo, there must be a firm conviction on his mind that falsehood or perjury will be punished, either in this world or the next, or he cannot be admitted as a witness. If he has not this belief he is disfranchised. In proof of this, I refer your honors to the great case of *Ormichund* against *Barker*, in Lord Chief Justice Wills' report. But in no case is a man allowed to be a witness

* On the Constitution page, 170.

† N. Y. Tribune, May 15 (?) '83.

that has no belief in future rewards and punishments for virtues or vices, nor ought he to be. We hold life, liberty and property in this country upon a system of oaths; oaths founded on a religious belief of some sort. And that system which would strike away the great substratum, destroy the safe possession of life, liberty, and property, destroy all the institutions of civil society, cannot and will not be considered as entitled to the protection of a court of Equity." Again, "for the decision that the essentials of Christianity are part of the common law of the land," Mr. Webster continues, "I refer your honors to 1 Vernon, p. 293,* where Lord Hale, who cannot be suspected of any bigotry on this subject, says, that to decry religion, and call it a cheat, tends to destroy all religion; and he also declares Christianity to be part of the common law of the land. Mr. N. Dane, in his Abridgement, ch. 219, recognizes the same principle. In 2 Strange, p. 834, case of the King against Wilson, the judges would not suffer it to be debated that writing against religion generally is an offence at common law. They laid stress upon the word 'generally,' because there might arise differences of opinion between religious writers on points of doctrine and so forth. So in Taylor's case, 3 Merivale, p. 405, by the High Court of Chancery, these doctrines were recognized and maintained. * * * There is a case of recent date, which, if the English law is to prevail, would seem conclusive,—1 Younge and Collyer's Reports, p. 411. The case was heard and decided in 1842, by Sir Knight Bruce, Vice Chancellor. The reporter's 'abstract or summary of the decision is this: '*Courts of Equity, in this country, will not sanction any system of education in which religion is not included.*' The Vice-Chancellor said, that the objection to the scheme proposed was not that it did not provide for religious instruction according to the doctrines of the Church of England, but that it did not provide for religious instruction at all; * * * * that any scheme of ed-

* We have had no desire to verify any of these references, and hence have sought no opportunity of doing so. They are carefully taken from Webster's published works.

ucation, without religion, would be worse than a mockery." Still further, to come nearer home, Mr. Webster continues: "The Christian religion is part and parcel of the public law of Pennsylvania. We have in the Charter of Pennsylvania, as prepared by its great founder, William Penn, we have in his 'great law' as it was called, the declaration, that the preservation of Christianity is one of the great and leading ends of government. Then the laws of Pennsylvania, the statutes against blasphemy, the violation of the Lord's day, and others to the same effect, proceed on this great, broad principle, that the preservation of Christianity is one of the main ends of government. On this head we have the case of *Updegraph v. The Commonwealth* (11 Sergeant and Rawle, p. 394,) in which a decision in accordance with this whole doctrine was given by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The solemn opinion pronounced by that tribunal begins by a general declaration that Christianity is and has always been, part of the common law of Pennsylvania." As Washington's name has been used as an authority, by Mr. Johnson in the passage above quoted, we may be excused for citing a portion of his Farewell Address: "Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

Indeed the Christian religion seems to be so thoroughly and really a legitimate object of the State's concern, that Chief Justice Story does not question the right of government to interfere even in matters of religion. On this point he says: "Indeed, the right of a society or government to interfere in matters of religion will hardly be contested by any persons who believe that piety, religion, and morality are intimately connected with the well-being of the State, and indispensable to the administration of civil justice. The promulgation of the great doctrines of religion, the being, and attributes and providence of one Almighty God; the responsibility to Him for all our actions, founded upon moral accountability; a future state of rewards and punishments; the cultivation of all the personal, social, and benevolent virtues; these never can be a matter of indifference in any well-ordered community. It is, indeed, difficult to conceive how any civilized society can well exist without them. And, at all events, it is impossible for those, who believe in the truth of Christianity as a divine revelation, to doubt that it is the especial duty of government to foster and encourage it among all the citizens and subjects. This is a point wholly distinct from that of the right of private judgment in matters of religion, and of the freedom of public worship, according to the dictates of one's conscience." * This latter is an important distinction, and it is well to bear it in mind. Christianity in the public schools is not to be confounded with the teaching of theological doctrines and abstract dogmas, which would naturally involve a clash and conflict of the various denominations and sects, and result in injurious consequences. And here again Mr. Johnson's article is misleading, inasmuch as he goes upon the assumption that Christian instruction must consist in the "formal and perfunctory exercises" which he deplures, whereas the truth is that "formal and perfunctory exercises" have never been of the essence of Christianity, and cannot, therefore, be fairly taken as representing the Christian system of moral instruction. It is the

* On the Constitution, p. 260.

essentials of Christianity as the basis of moral character, the fundamental truths of our holy religion as constituting the ethical framework of our social fabric, that must be taught the youth of our land, and it is such teaching that is assailed when it is proposed to substitute a system of secular morality.

There is great objection made to religious instruction in the public schools on the ground of the multitude and differences of sects, an "objection," as Daniel Webster says, "urged by all the lower and more vulgar schools of infidelity throughout the world," and we cannot forbear quoting at some length from his argument, which expresses, with so much greater cogency than we could bring to bear, the potency of all that we could wish to say upon the subject: "In all these schools, called schools of Rationalism in Germany, Socialism in England, and by various other names in various countries which they infest, this is the universal cant. The first step of all these philosophical moralists and regenerators of the human race is to attack the agency through which religion and Christianity are administered to man. But in this there is nothing new or original" (as he shows by extracts from the writings of Paine and Volney). "It is but the old story, the old infidel argument. It is notorious that there are certain great religious truths which are admitted and believed by all Christians. All believe in the existence of a God. All believe in the immortality of the soul. All believe in the responsibility, in another world, for our conduct in this. All believe in the divine authority of the New Testament. . . . And cannot all these great truths be taught to children without their minds being perplexed with clashing doctrines and sectarian controversies? Most certainly they can.

"And, to compare secular with religious matters, what would become of the organization of society, what would become of man as a social being, in connection with the social system, if we applied this mode of reasoning to him in his social relations? We have a constitutional government, about the powers, and limitations, and uses of which there is a vast amount of

differences of belief. Your honors have a body of laws, now before you, in relation to which differences of opinion almost innumerable are daily spread before the courts ; in all these we see clashing doctrines and opinions advanced daily, to as great an extent as in the religious world.

“Apply this mode of reasoning to human institutions, and you will tear them all up by the root ; as you would inevitably tear all divine institutions up by the root, if such reasoning is to prevail. At the meeting of the first Congress there was a doubt in the minds of many of the propriety of opening the session with prayer, and the reason assigned was, as here, the great diversity of opinion and religious belief. At length Mr. Samuel Adams, with his gray hairs hanging about his shoulders, and with an impressive venerableness now seldom to be met with (I suppose owing to the difference of habits), rose in that assembly, and, with the air of a perfect Puritan, said that it did not become men, professing to be Christian men, who had come together for solemn deliberation in the hour of their extremity, to say that there was so wide a difference in their religious belief, that they could not, as one man, bow the knee in prayer to the Almighty, whose advice and assistance they hoped to obtain. Independent as he was, and an enemy to all prelacy as he was known to be, he moved that the Rev. Mr. Duché, of the Episcopal Church, should address the Throne of Grace in prayer. And John Adams, in a letter to his wife, says that he never saw a more moving spectacle. Mr. Duché read the Episcopal service of the Church of England, and then, as if moved by the occasion, he broke out into extemporaneous prayer. And those men, who were then about to resort to force to obtain their rights, were moved to tears ; and floods of tears, Mr. Adams says, ran down the cheeks of the pacific Quakers who formed part of that most interesting assembly. Depend upon it, where there is a spirit of Christianity, there is a spirit which rises above forms, above ceremonies, independent of sect or creed and the controversies of clashing doctrines.”

Let it not be supposed that we are losing sight of the ques-

tion at issue, but it is all-important that we should have a clear perception of what is meant by pure Christianity before we can fairly consider the proposition of setting it aside as an inefficient means of moral instruction. We must first prove its inefficiency before we can reach out for something to take its place. And no candid mind will be satisfied with the statement that it is inefficient because it has, forsooth, been misused in the practice of the public schools, because it has been made to consist in "formal and perfunctory exercises," or even because it has been dragged down to the low level of bigotry and the strife of sects. No amount of bible-reading, formal prayer, or lip-service of any kind is regarded, nor has ever been regarded, as sufficient for the practice of true Christianity. All such caricatures of our holy religion the Master Himself condemned in unequivocal terms, but He by no means considered it necessary to include in the condemnation the holy religion itself, as seems to be the tendency now-a-days. Because a good thing is capable of abuse, must we therefore abolish it? Were it not better to correct the abuse itself? So it might be well to set ourselves the task of correcting what is wrong in the *modus operandi* of teaching the system of Christian morals, as already in vogue to so large an extent in the Common Schools of our land, rather than to set our heads together for the production of a new system that is to be purely human, purely rational, and purely secular. At any rate, we may well pause before we seriously consider a question which unmistakably involves the expulsion of Christianity from our public schools, for no better reasons than such as would suffice to drive it from our families, our churches, and our land. To say that the Christian training received in the family, the church school, and the church itself, would be a sufficient safeguard against the danger of skepticism, rationalism, and irreligion so generally apprehended from any and every unchristian system of morality, is only to say that Christianity is, after all, the only true source and basis of a sound, practical morality, and that there is no good reason why it should not be recognized as such in the public schools.

We are sure that the sense of moral duty as exercised by the multitudes of Christian believers comes not by the solution of "theological problems and supernatural mysteries"; no more does it come by rational speculation and intellectual processes; but rather it comes along with the conviction of faith, that "I am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "To fear God and keep His commandments is the whole [duty] of man," and all human learning has true significance only as it is an utterance of the divine wisdom. As the intelligence in no sense creates scientific truth in its various forms, but only apprehends it by virtue of its spiritual powers, so neither does the will in any sense create the good, but only brings it to pass in finite and relative form, as it already exists in the eternal purposes of the Infinite and Absolute. The highest form of the good, then, is that in which the human will and the divine become identical, fully correspondent one with the other in act. "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me), to do Thy will, Oh God." "Not my will, but Thine be done." Therefore it seems utterly unreasonable to talk about morality as having its source in anything but the supernatural; and we confess we cannot understand Mr. Johnson, when he says "religion and morality have a common source in that human nature which is made in the image and likeness of God, and that the latter may be cultivated by itself, without reference to that supernaturalism which forms so large a part of the current religions." How can that be regarded as a common source which necessitates a reference to supernaturalism in the one case and not in the other? Or does the writer mean to imply that it is a mistake that supernaturalism should form any considerable part of religion? But we do not wish to quibble, only it does seem strange that a man who professes faith in Christianity, should feel obliged to derive his moral principles from any lower, any less infallible source than the incarnate Word. "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." "The Saviour said, 'Suffer little children to come unto Me'; He

did not consider it necessary to send them first for lessons in morals to the schools of the Pharisees, or to the unbelieving Sadducees,—nor to read the lessons and precepts phylacteried on the garments of the Jewish priesthood; He said nothing of different creeds or clashing doctrines; but He opened at once to the youthful mind the everlasting fountain of living waters, the only source of eternal truths."

It is not meant, of course, to convert the school-room into a chapel or a monastic establishment, although we are not sure but that, in the long run, it were better for some schools if they were more like either the one or the other; neither are we one of those who decry the schools as godless, because they are not thus outwardly and formally religious,—and our schools, in the main, do not deserve to be so stigmatised; but where there is no recognition of God as the absolute reason of the universe, of man and all that concerns him,—where all the instruction is not sanctified by constant reference to the divine spirit of absolute truth,—where there is no sense of the presence of supernatural powers and realities, in the bosom of which the natural and finite forms of existence continually find their own proper interpretation and reason,—where there is no steady purpose of subordinating human learning to the higher interests of human faith in the promises of the Gospel to eternal salvation,—where there is no prayerful sense of dependence upon the overshadowing providence of the Most High,—and, especially, where there is all the while being made a studied effort at excluding in any recognizable form everything partaking of a religious nature,—where this is done, we may as well call the thing by its right name and pronounce it a godless proceeding. And, if these be prejudices, rather than convictions and principles, which we are asked to relinquish, we feel obliged to say that our prejudices are our principles; and we are prepared to stand by them.

A devout and pious nature is best cultivated by devout and pious practices. An earnest prayer to the God and Father of our humanity, at the opening of the school, can certainly not

make the study of grammar and arithmetic any less profitable, but may go very far towards cultivating a habit of reverence for things sacred and holy, which few will dispute as an important element in human character. We are bound to do all we can towards developing the child's ideas of duty into the glory of positive, practical and unfailing virtue. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." And it is a most flagrant begging of the question when Mr. Johnson holds up "the example of Jesus, who neither prefaced nor concluded one of His public discourses with prayer." As if the whole life of the Saviour was not one continuous prayer! Certainly the writer cannot mean, by this, to convey the impression that the office of public prayer has no sanction from the Saviour? If so, we can only say that the great mass of Christian believers think otherwise, and are to be trusted for holding fast to the propriety, efficacy, and sanctity of prayer. Nothing seems to have a clearer title to scriptural warrant than just this practice. "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Again, when he asks, "will the sticklers for religious ceremonies in the schools condescend to tell us how many lessons may be learned, how many classes recite, before the teacher must either stop to offer a prayer, or suffer his school to lapse into a condition of godlessness?" he mistakes entirely the character of the Christian instruction demanded for the schools. Neither the flippancy nor the sneer of such a query will convince anybody. We have already intimated what the nature of the Christian instruction for the schools should be. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you."

What is most especially needed for the proper nurture of children, is a constantly surrounding atmosphere of Christianity, so that they may not have their young souls hardened into unbelief, and their budding lives immersed in the things of this world. They should have impressed upon their hearts no lower motive for right thinking and studying, than for right doing and living; and we know of no other way to do this than to

hold up to them, early and clearly, the true end of life—its purpose in the world for good. How can this be done excepting through the means of grace as ordained of God in the Christian religion? We know of no higher form of immorality than the presumption of the human reason to put the will in bondage and make itself the norm and rule of conduct; and so we know of no higher form of morality than where the reason, informed with intelligence, becomes, through the bond of faith, the ready servant of the will that bows in humble submission to the divine. Such a morality perfects our manhood, ennobles work, sanctifies learning, and purifies every relation and transaction of our life; and is fit for the family, the school, the community, the state and the church.

We have no detailed system to present. This has not been our object. We have only been concerned to bring into view what we firmly regard as the only safe and abiding principles to be adhered to in any system of education that is to have any permanent value for the formation of solid character. The dangerous fallacy underlying every attempt to construct a system of morals upon any other basis than the person of Christ, cannot be too often or too completely exposed. Neither Mr. Ingersoll, nor anybody else, can separate the "morality of the gospels" from the Gospel itself, as a revelation of the Divine, and accept it "as the law of life," without accepting, at the same time, the Life itself. It reminds one of the folly of the defaulting bank cashier who reposed his honesty in his Sunday-school Superintendency. Men want the substance, not the semblance,—for the reason, concrete truth, and not abstract formulas,—for the body, food, and not laws of digestion,—for the will, the embodiment of the absolute good in actual form, and not a system of scientific morality,—for the entire personal being, a personal Saviour as the surety of everlasting life, and not philosophical speculations about the soul and immortality. "When the foundations of a building are sapped, we should seek rather for architects to reconstruct the whole edifice, than for artists to adorn the walls." As men

get nearer Christ, they get nearer a face-to-face comprehension of their duties to their Maker, their fellow-men, and themselves; and no system of education—least of all a State system can safely leave this out of account.

IV.

REGENERATION.

BY REV. DR. C. R. LANE.

THE religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is the only one known among men that requires and professes to provide for a change in the nature of its subjects. In one capital point, therefore, it differs from every other system; and this point of difference, on the one hand, assumes that it is of Divine origin and applied by Divine power, for the constitution of nature is beyond the power of man; and on the other, it affords a rational test of its truth by way of observing the results which the alleged change of nature produces on the conduct of those who profess to be under its influence. For it is in vain that the Scriptures teach either the depravity of men or their renewal, unless results can be found in the conduct of men which are in accordance with the doctrine.

With regard to depravity there is no difficulty. For without dispute the conduct of men accords with the doctrine, and it requires in order to its explanation just such a source as the Scriptures allege; but with regard to the other side of the question, the matter is not as generally admitted, nor is it in fact as evident.

I.

The first thing to be done, therefore, is to inquire whether the observed facts accord with the theory of a change in the nature of man, the change being taken at this stage of the

discussion in a general sense, that is, apart from its specific nature as taught in detail in the Scriptures, for if such facts cannot be found in an historical record of eighteen centuries, then either the doctrine is not true, or if true, it is not worth investigating. The question, therefore, comes to this: What evidence, independent of the Scriptures, does the world furnish to prove that the doctrine of Regeneration is true, a reality in its nature, because powerful in its influence over the conduct of men—so powerful that the conduct can in reason be accounted for in no other way?

1. The first thing that attracts attention is the way Christians regard the Lord Jesus Christ.

This regard may be summed up in two things, namely, supreme love to Christ, and unreserved obedience to His commandments. The love required and professed is stronger than that of race or country or family or even of life itself, and the obedience superior to that of every other demand; and as a fact, so far in the history of Christianity, it has been found that whenever and wherever the call has been made, multitudes of men and women, young and old, have come forward ready to sunder every earthly tie and to endure every kind and degree of suffering man has been able to devise rather than deny Christ. Those who have thus in every age, including the present, confessed Christ, are so many and they are found in such different circumstances that the most rational way of accounting for the undeniable effect is to admit the reality of the alleged cause. For the cases exhibited are too numerous and too varied to be accounted for by deception, and continued too long to be explained by enthusiasm.

The unreserved obedience, therefore, which is in fact rendered to the commands of Christ must be taken as proof of love to Christ Himself; and the love, because it is not common to all men but peculiar to some, is not a natural element in man, and therefore its origin must be sought outside of the natural disposition of men. For men of the same inclinations, desires and tastes cannot like and dislike the same thing, render and refuse to render the same service.

2. The followers of the Lord Jesus Christ differ from other men in the way they regard the Bible. They revere it as the Word of God. They read it, study it, go to it for direction, encouragement and comfort, write and read commentaries on it, and spend time and money to send it to the destitute, for no reason that can be divined unless it be to communicate to others the blessings they themselves get from it. It is the daily companion and solace of some, while of others, some neglect it, and some hate it. From this fact the fair inference is that there is something in the one class of persons which is not in the other.

3. The observance of the Sabbath by way of meeting for prayer and praise and religious instruction, which the men of the world neglect, shows that Christians are different from other men.

For this course of conduct no satisfactory explanation can be given except the fact that Christians really find in these exercises the profit and delight they profess to find. For they spend millions upon millions in building churches and maintaining worship; and this is done by men of all possible differences in age, information, fortune and antecedents. In all this variety in every generation and in every part of the world, there is something in each that makes them all alike. They are drawn to the same place, engage in the same services, entertain the same hopes and profess love and obedience to the same Master. The experience of one is the experience of all. That of a king a millennium before Christ came is the same as that of a peasant a millennium after, and of all classes and in all generations. On this subject the ignorant understand the books of the learned, and the learned are instructed and encouraged by the conversation of the ignorant.

In the way, therefore, in which Christians serve a Master from whom they neither expect nor receive any earthly good, regard the Bible as His Word and observe the Sabbath as His day against all the opposition they encounter and the expense they incur; in these things there is abundant proof not only that Christians are sincere in their convictions, but that as

a whole, whatever doubts may be entertained as to particular cases, they are different from other men as to their dispositions, desires, tastes and sources of enjoyment. It is not pretended of course that from these facts the Scriptural doctrine can be constructed, but it is insisted that the ground of its necessity as a cause is laid in facts that cannot be denied and must in some way be explained. For until the observed difference is accounted for, the difference itself is as really a mystery as the change which the Scriptures allege as its cause.

II.

This brings us in the next place to inquire in particular as to the Nature of Regeneration without prejudice to the doctrine as alleged, and in some of its aspects admitted to be mysterious.

What Regeneration is may be learned—

First: From the names by which it is designated in the Scriptures.

1. Regeneration is spoken of as a Divine calling. "The God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Jesus Christ, after that ye have suffered a while make you perfect," 1 Pet. 5: 10. "God, who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace," 2 Tim. 1: 9. "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose . . . whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified," Rom. 8: 28, 30. "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called." Eph. 4: 1.

This calling is "from darkness into light." 1 Pet. 2: 9, "Unto the fellowship of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord," 1 Cor. 1: 9. "Into the grace of Christ," Gal. 1: 6, and, "To the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Thess. 2: 14.

In accordance with this view, Christians are spoken of as "the called," 1 Cor. 1 : 24, "the called of Jesus Christ," and "called to be saints," Rom 1 : 6, 7. The called, viz. "sanctified by God, the Father, and kept by Jesus Christ," Jude 1. "Called, chosen and faithful," Rev. 17 : 14.

2. It is spoken of as the giving of a new heart : "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean : from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you : and I will take the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep all my judgments and do them," Ez. 36 : 25-7. "I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you, and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh : and I will give them a heart of flesh, that they may walk in my statutes and do them," Ez. 11 : 19, 20.

3. It is called a new creation. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature : old things are passed away ; behold, all things are become new," 2 Cor. 5 : 17. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature," Gal. 6 : 15. "For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works," Eph. 2 : 10.

Secondly : What Regeneration is, may be learned from the different forms in which it is presented.

1. It is a new birth. Christians are born of God—"born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever," 1 Pet. 1 : 23.

Consequently,

2. It is the beginning of a new life. "God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ," and hence,

3. The contrast between the old man and the new : "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts ; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind ; and that ye put on the new

man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. 4: 22-24.

Thirdly: The results produced show what is the nature of the change.

These are:

1. A change in the view taken of Divine things. There is given a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of God, the eyes of the understanding are enlightened, the hope of His calling is known, the richness of His inheritance in the saints, and the greatness of His power.

2. In this enlightenment of the mind there is such a change in the relation of the soul to God as amounts to a revolution. Those who were the enemies of God in their minds by wicked works become His friends, aliens become fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God, and strangers become children—sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. The transfer is complete from the kingdom of Satan to that of God's dear Son.

III.

The next point to be considered relates to the authorship of Regeneration.

First: If the change is in fact such as it has been described to be; if it is such a calling as leads the called from a life devoted to self to a life devoted to Christ; if it secures a new heart, because it is a new creature; if it is a new birth followed by a new life; if it does produce new views in regard to Divine things, and acquire citizenship in a new kingdom:—if these things are so, then it requires no argument to prove that the change is beyond created power.

Secondly: If the phrases used in the Scriptures to describe men in their natural condition are correct, such as The bondage of corruption, The service of corruption, Sowing to the flesh. Alienated from God and His enemies in their mind by wicked works, Dead in trespasses and sins; then there can be no real desire in the heart of man to effect this change in himself,

For we cannot but act according to our nature. We cannot love what we hate, or hate what we love by a volition. For in fact we do and by possibility we can only love and hate, approve and disapprove of what is or is not consonant with and agreeable to our nature; and that for the reason that they are so. No other reason can be given. If then, our judgment moral or intellectual as to any subject is to be changed, there must be a change either in ourselves or in the object contemplated. But we cannot change the nature of external things; and how can we change our own nature? It will not relieve the difficulty to say that we have the aid of our will. For the volitions are determined by our nature, and our nature itself is corrupt. The understanding is darkened and the affections are vitiated. They are precisely the things that need to be changed. So far, therefore, as our own power is concerned, the relation between the mind contemplating, and the object contemplated must remain the same. To this relation opposite affections can be neither proper, natural nor possible. For if they were, man would be a being without preferences, which is not the fact. Man does prefer. According to the Scriptures, he prefers sin to holiness; and therefore he cannot at the same time prefer holiness to sin, and preferring sin to holiness there can be no motive for choosing holiness rather than sin except that derived from the consequences of sin, that is, its punishment. But this external motive, while it can and does restrain acts of sin, does not and cannot change a sinful nature. For a man is not the less depraved because he sometimes hesitates through fear to act according to the desires of his heart, and to indulge the inclinations of his nature.

But, Thirdly, Whatever may be thought of the conclusions of human reason, drawn from the nature of the work to be done and the moral condition of men, the Scriptures are explicit both positively and negatively. The children of God are born of God; not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man; that is, their condition is due neither to hereditary descent nor to the efforts of their depraved nature, nor is it the

effect of any external rites, such as Circumcision or Baptism. By these things one may become a Jew outwardly, but that is not circumcision which is (only) outward in the flesh. For that which is born of the flesh, in any of its forms, is simply and only flesh.

A statement more in detail of the same truth is in these words: We ourselves were also sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God, our Saviour, toward men appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.

Here men are described as they are by nature, disobedient, hateful and hating; and as the object of the renewing influence of the Holy Spirit, the heirs of eternal life, derived primarily from the kindness and love of the Father, meritoriously from the Son, and efficiently, proximately and personally from the Holy Ghost. Regeneration therefore is a change which God works from sin to holiness, from spiritual death to spiritual life. The life may be faint, but it is life; the obedience is imperfect but it is sincere; worthless indeed as a matter of law but precious as to the Gospel, because it is the evidence of a vital union with the Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners.

At this point, there arises a very interesting and important question, viz, Upon what does the action of the Holy Spirit in regeneration terminate?

The answer to this question is important, on the one hand, as to the precise nature of Regeneration considered as an effect produced by the Spirit's action in its relation to Mental Philosophy; and on the other, because it connects what is taught in the Word of God with Christian experience.

In answering this question, the 1st remark is, That the action of the Holy Spirit does not terminate on the substance of the

mind by way of imparting to it any new faculties or properties, or of taking away any possessed by men in their natural condition. For, in the first place, negatively, this view is not presented in the Scriptures; nor have the renewed any conscious experience of such a change wrought upon or produced in them.

In the next place, this view cannot be the correct one, because the state of man as unrenewed does not require any change in this respect. For the difficulty is not that such persons cannot approve and disapprove, love and hate; but that they love what they ought to hate and hate what they ought to love. It is not the exercise of proper affections that unrenewed men lack, but the affections in proper exercise.

The same conclusion may be reached from another direction. All the duties due from the renewed man are obligatory on all men. Indeed the most depraved being in the universe is under the same obligation to love and serve God as the holiest. Now plainly this could not be, if the nature of depravity is such that it takes away from the mind the faculty or power of perceiving things as good and evil; for until things are so perceived there can be no approbation or disapprobation of them as such, and, therefore, no feeling of obligation to pursue the one or avoid the other. Such inability vitiates obligation, for moral excellence even the highest cannot claim esteem from those who, for this reason, cannot discern it. But all men, however depraved, are justly required to love and obey God, because they can and do discern His excellence, on the one hand as the God of nature in giving us rain and fruitful seasons, and as the God of grace in giving His only and well-beloved Son to be our Saviour. But in regard to the one, they are largely forgetful of Him; and in regard to the other, they refuse to forsake sin, because they love it, and to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ on account of the high estimate they place on their own righteousness. Their sinfulness and guilt, therefore, consist precisely in this: Namely, that a view of God as just in punishing sin, and for that reason sovereign in the exercise

of His mercy calls forth not love but enmity, not submission but rebellion varying in all degrees from mere dislike to the most determined opposition. It is this perversion that needs conversion. What is necessary then, and all that is necessary, is not that man acquire some new faculties or part with any already possessed, but that in the exercise of the same faculties, they hate what they now love and love what they now hate. It is not, therefore, new affections and dispositions that are required, but the old affections revolutionized, love into hatred and hatred into love. For both love and hatred are as natural and as necessary to the renewed man as to the unrenewed. The old man and the new, therefore, both have need precisely and the same faculties, feelings and dispositions. In this they are alike, but they differ in that the one loves darkness, while the other loves light; the one loves holiness and hates sin, while the other loves sin and hates holiness; and as a consequence the one accepts the grace of God and the other refuses it.

2nd. The next remark is that the action of the Spirit does not terminate merely on the acts of the mind. Right acts are indeed produced, but this is by no means the whole of the result. For, in the first place, it is not commensurate with the doctrine of Depravity, that there is a constant and sufficient cause of wicked acts in the depraved nature of man, that is, in his vicious principles and dispositions; and in the next, because this view does not exhaust the nature of the change as to that thoroughness which is implied in the expressions *Born again, Created in Christ Jesus unto good works, Alive from the dead.* As, therefore, in the Fall our nature became depraved, and as this depravity is necessary and sufficient to account for living unto sin; so the Regeneration which restores man must reach to and purify the same principles of our nature in order that our self-originated acts may have a real and general tendency in the opposite direction, that is, that we may live unto holiness. It is, therefore, 3dly. Upon these depraved and vitiated principles of the soul that the renewing act of the Holy Spirit does terminate—upon man as a moral agent, who can love and

hate, approve or disapprove, yield to persuasions or refuse to yield, as the motives presented are agreeable to his nature or disagreeable, sufficient in his view to determine choice this way rather than that or insufficient.

That is, the correct view can be shown by several conditions.

First: The nature of the case demands precisely such a change; for to this extent is our nature infected by sin. The soul of man feels that it is perverted in its highest and best affections and directed by unworthy motives to unworthy ends: that it is darkened by sin, and yet has light enough to see and feel that it is fallen, and weak in all its nobler impulses. It feels its obligation to love and obey God as a God of justice, mercy and truth, and yet it feels averse both to God and His service.

Secondly: This view is in accordance with all the facts in the case and accounts for them. It accounts for the obligation which every one feels to obey God, because he perceives that God is worthy of his obedience; for his guilt in not obeying Him, because he prefers sin to holiness; and for a life of obedience, because his natural dispositions and preferences in regard to sin and holiness have been changed by the power of the Holy Ghost.

In regard to sin and holiness, therefore, the revolution is complete. The moral dispositions, feelings and preferences are radically changed. In relation to the same objects, one class of moral perceptions and feelings have taken the place of another. What was once repulsive is now attractive, what is now earnestly sought was once carefully shunned, namely, sin, as degradation and death, holiness as excellence and life.

In relation to the work of the Holy Spirit, as now presented, it is to be noted 1st, that these different forms are, in substance, one and the same. Enlightening the understanding to perceive the Truth and changing the affections in regard to it is the same as giving a new heart; and the result naturally consequent on such a change is equivalent to putting off the old man and putting on the new. If, therefore, it is considered in the

one case, in what respects the mind after the change differs from the mind before it ; or in the other, what changes are wrought upon the faculties of the soul in reference to the facts, the duties and the privileges of the Gospel, it is plain that the work of the Spirit viewed both in degree and extent is such as is properly called a regeneration, a resurrection to a new life.

2nd. It is to be noted that the view of regeneration here presented, whether taken as a whole or by parts, is such as accounts for all the results, both internal and external, which the Scriptures call for.

As to the one form, there can be no dispute. It admits neither of argument nor illustration ; for nothing can be plainer than the fact that the exercises of the new heart are and will be those natural and proper to it ; but the other form admits of analysis. The intellectual powers of the mind, being enlightened, perceive certain relations as real and certain propositions as true. The affections, being purified, approve of them as good, and hence the volitions cannot but be right. Here are acts in accordance with the Law of God.

Again : The faculties of the mind, being exercised according to their nature must improve in accordance with an unalterable law common to all intelligent creatures. The perception of the understanding becomes keener, and the approval of the affections more hearty ; consequently the volitions express the real internal state of mind more and more accurately, until at length they come to partake rather of the nature of purpose than of separate volitions.

Thirdly : This view is confirmed by the fact that it accords with all we know from the Scriptures or consciousness of the nature of sin. For, sin is not an entity which must be destroyed and its place supplied by another entity in order to love God and obey Him, for inability arising from such a source would vitiate the obligation which all feel, because it would render the performance of the duty physically impossible on account of a physical defect ; nor is it only a derangement in the operation of the mental faculties, for in that case the re-

adjustment of them without a change in their nature would meet the whole difficulty ; nor is sin merely a defect in the sense that it is only the lack of disposition or inclination, for this will not account for the instinctive aversion all men feel to the requirements of the Gospel ; but it is a positive moral perverseness in the faculties themselves and therefore also in their operations, which leads a man to hate evangelical truth when he perceives it and refuse to discharge the obligation he feels in reference to it. It is this perverseness, otherwise called depravity, that needs to be remedied, that the Gospel proposes to remedy, and that the Holy Spirit does in fact remedy by way of working a change in the nature of the faculties themselves, and therefore also in the direction of their exercises, towards Christ instead of from Him, because renewed in His likeness.

IV.

As to the Mode of Regeneration nothing is known ; and if the representations given in the Scriptures are correct, nothing can be known. For the production of life in all its forms, the lowest as well as the highest, lies beyond the sphere of our knowledge, as inscrutable to creatures as creation out of nothing. For regeneration as a divine act is no more and no less than all other divine acts simply beyond the comprehension of finite beings. It cannot be found out by searching, nor could an explanation if given be understood. The new life of the soul, therefore, is as much and no more a mystery than life of any other kind. It is not, therefore, an objection, as some have made it, to the doctrine under consideration, that the question cannot be answered by man to man, or even by God Himself to His creatures,—How can a man be born when he is old ? For, The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth ; so is every one that is born of the Spirit. For, as in the one case, so in the other also, our knowledge is derived not from reasoning in regard to the nature of the cause and the mode of its operation, but by observing the effects pro-

duced ; and the knowledge derived from this source is, as far as it goes, just as certain as any other kind of knowledge, and it is just as useful as it would be if both the nature of the cause and the mode of its operation were fully understood. The evidence, therefore, fulfils all the conditions required in other sciences to make it proof, to those who will take the trouble to examine it ; and therefore it is as unscientific in regard to the truths of religion, considered as a science, as it would be considered in regard to truths of another kind to raise difficulties originating in our ignorance as barriers against our knowledge. For the common judgment of mankind is that what we do know is of more weight as evidence than what we do not know.

V.

The facts as found therefore are: 1st. That in the great current of human conduct, there is a counter-current, not large indeed comparatively, but uniform in its direction and persistent, making headway against all the opposition of whatever kind, violent or seductive, that has as yet been brought to bear upon it.

This statement is not a mere affirmation. It is a fact which the opponents of Christianity are compelled to admit in the language they use to express their opinion of it. This language is sometimes that of pity—Piety is enthusiasm ; sometimes of hatred—Christianity is fanaticism ; and sometimes of contempt—Religion is superstition. But in this language, back of and under it, there is a reality. For such long-continued enthusiasm, such sober-minded fanaticism and superstition supported by so much and such varied rational evidence, the thing, whatever it is, whether enthusiasm or fanaticism or superstition, or all combined, maintained so long at so great an expense both of time and money, and by self-abnegation even unto death, this needs to be accounted for as much as the religion which it is supposed to displace ; and the task when attempted will be found no easier.

2dly. This current is always found where the Bible is found, and it is found nowhere else.

Both the current itself, therefore, and its place in the great stream of human life must be accounted for in some way—by philosophy or by religion, natural or supernatural.

Philosophy can account neither for the fact nor for its place in relation to the Bible. It cannot account for the fact, because it must refer the two counter effects to the same cause, namely the nature of man, which would be sufficient to account for either if the other did not exist, but not for both as coexisting; nor can philosophy offer any satisfactory explanation as to the place in which the difference is found, for the Bible as a natural cause ought to produce the same effect on all who have any knowledge of it, while the evident fact is that its influence in this respect is confined to only a part, and indeed to a very small part of those who have it.

Natural religion has no satisfactory solution to offer. For, if the general course of human conduct is due to the obligations which men feel that nature imposes, then the same cause cannot also produce another effect totally different in kind and more powerful than nature in its influence over the minds of those who are subject to its operation. Both natural religion, therefore, and philosophy fail at the same point. Both can account for either effect taken apart from the other; neither can account for both taken together as they actually exist in the nature of things.

At this point, the Bible, claiming a supernatural origin, and teaching that the peculiar and exceptional effects connected with it are due to a supernatural agency, comes to our relief, and does what philosophy and natural religion cannot do, that is, admitting the existence of the one fact, it proposes as an explanation of the other coexisting fact the doctrine of regeneration, a cause potentially adequate in its nature and efficiently adequate in its energy to produce it. The Bible, therefore, because it has an adequate explanation to offer, has a right to be heard, and the explanation it offers has a claim to be accepted, at least

until some other is proposed, as satisfactory in its nature as a theory, and as well sustained by evidence as a fact.

3dly. It is a fact that the doctrines of depravity and regeneration are so united in the Scriptures that they must both stand or both fall together. For if men are depraved by sin, they need to be regenerated in order to restoration; and if they need to be regenerated, it is because they are depraved. All the evidence, therefore, that goes to prove the one, goes with equal force to prove the other. So deep and broad and strong is the foundation laid in the nature of things and the Word of God for our faith in the remedial system in general and for the doctrine of regeneration as a part of it in particular. The fact therefore is that the Bible takes into the account all the known facts in the case—facts as mysterious without the doctrine of regeneration as the doctrine itself—and provides for them; and this is all the evidence any abstract science does or can afford its most devoted followers; but,

4thly. It is also a fact that Christianity, in addition to all this external evidence, has another kind of proof for Christians. They do the will of God and they know of the doctrine. They know that they are ill-deserving, and that they once feared more than they feared anything else that they would receive the ill they deserved; and they know that now sin is their chief concern, not because it makes them deserving of punishment, but because of its inherent evil nature, and therefore, as of such a nature, hateful in God's sight and their own; they know that duties once the most irksome are now a delight; they know that the doctrines which they once turned from with instinctive aversion are the very things, and the only things, in which they now rejoice as the ground of all their hopes. To Christians, therefore, the proof of Christianity is not mechanical. To them, its verifications are neither by measurements nor instruments, nor is it merely rational, but it terminates far down in the depths of consciousness, and so it makes the proof the highest kind of certainty beings not omniscient have. For if we cannot trust consciousness we cannot trust anything, neither the things we

know, if there be any such, nor the things we do not know. The subjective evidence, therefore, wherever it exists, is perfect after its kind. Nothing more is possible, nothing different is desirable; and they who reject the external evidence put themselves under obligation as philosophers to account on some known and recognized natural principles for the existence of the Church of Christ in the world and for its continuation. For, as a natural growth and persistency, the Church is as great a mystery as the account the Scriptures render of it. If, therefore, believers in Christ are the victims of superstition, unbelievers are no less the sport of a perplexity which undeniable facts continually and relentlessly press upon them, and from which reason questioned and even tortured for ages and generations has as yet refused to furnish them any way of escape.

VI.

This change thus in some respects entirely within, and in other respects entirely without the sphere of our knowledge, the Scriptures declare to be necessary: Ye must be born again.

This necessity is not absolute, but conditional to an end, namely, entering the kingdom of God, and as a qualification for its duties and enjoyments. Hence the importance to every one of a satisfactory answer to the question: Am I born again; washed in regeneration, and renewed by the Holy Ghost?

The answer to this question to be of any value must be derived from a consideration of the change itself. Hence what any one has to do in order to determine the matter is to examine himself by the tests which the doctrine itself presents, namely, Has he been so called that he heeds the divine voice and obeys it, as opposed to former neglect and disobedience? Has he a new heart, that is, a heart in which the divine law is written and loved, as opposed to a heart *averse* to its requirements and chafing under them as restraints? Is he a new creature, that is, one that relies on Christ instead of relying on himself, his native goodness, moral excellence, or his observance

of divine ordinances? Has he been born of God in such a way that he has begun a new life, which makes itself manifest by putting off the old man and putting on the new, and thereby evoking a spiritual conflict between two contrary spirits within him? Has he been so enlightened that he takes different views of sin and of himself as a sinner, and also of God and His grace; of its freeness in God and of its necessity to himself, and of its power in himself to make an enemy of God His friend; to make an alien transfer his allegiance and his affections to another Sovereign, and his interests to another country; to make a stranger a fellow-citizen with the saints and of the household of God; to produce in the heart of a slave the hopes and the fears, the love and the obedience of a child; and to view the expectations of an heir of God through Christ as his greatest good and only satisfying portion?

These intellectual perceptions of truth and such feelings in regard to it are of the substance of the change wrought by the Holy Spirit in regeneration. The difference, therefore, between the regenerated man and the unregenerated is that while the one is blind to these truths, the other sees them; while the one is dead to these feelings, the other has them. Where, therefore, these things are there also there is, and where they are not, there, on the other hand, there is not and there cannot be a good hope through grace of everlasting life.

V.

LIFE AND IMMORTALITY.

BY REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.

"Gird up thy mind to contemplation, trembling inhabitant of earth :
Tenant of a hovel for a day—thou art heir of the universe forever !
For, neither congealing of the grave, nor gulping waters of the firmament,
Nor expansive airs of heaven, nor dissipative fires of Gehenna,
Nor rust of rest, nor wear nor waste, nor loss, nor chance, nor change,
Shall avail to quench or overwhelm the spark of soul within thee."

Tupper.

WE propose to discuss a subject, which, even after all should be said about it that the highest human mind could conceive, or has ever conceived, still lies before us, vast as the ocean ; towers before our uplifted eyes in unscalable heights, gaps before us in unfathomable depths. The immortality of the soul ! We can appropriately say with the poet :

"Who shall imagine Immortality, or picture its illimitable prospect ?
How feebly can a faltering tongue express the vast idea !"

"There is a drawback," says Emerson, "to the value of all statements of the doctrine ; and I think that one abstains from writing or printing on the immortality of the soul, because when he comes to the end of his statement, the hungry eyes that run through it will close disappointed." Why then write about it ? do you ask ? We answer : Because, although we cannot conceive of its "illimitable prospect," and know it in all its fulness, yet we know enough about it to cheer our hearts ; we know enough of its truth to shed a divine light into the darkness of the tomb, chasing away its gloominess, and removing its chilli-

ness. We most emphatically repudiate the suicidal procedure of that class of men who, because they cannot know *all* about a subject, ignore even that which they can know, and is a comfort and blessing to them. Why refuse to be guided by the clear light of the sun because it does not give more light?

We write about it, also, because of the importance of the doctrine itself and, at the present time, of earnest thought and discussion of it. We need, says Newman Smyth, to see more of theological discussion, with regard especially to the doctrines of the future life, in our theological seminaries and in our religious literature. (Introduction to "Dorner on the Future State," p. 32, 1883.)

Is this life all there is for man? Do we, when our bodies are carried to the tomb, decay like them? Or is this life but the beginning of a life to come? Is it, as Young says:

* * * * * "The bud of being, the dim dawn,
The twilight of our day, the vestibule!"

Is it true as he says further:

"Life's theatre as yet is shut, and death,
Strong death alone can heave its massive bar,
This gross impediment of clay remove,
And make us embryos of existence free.
From real life; but little more remote
Is he, not yet a candidate for light,
The future embryo, slumbering in his sire?"

(*"Night Thoughts"*--*Night I.*)

If so, then how earnestly ought we to endeavor to learn all we can about the life to come.

We turn to the Book, which purports to teach us about it; the only Book which speaks with authority on the subject. We desire to study one expression in it, well worth special study, viz.: "Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." (*II Tim.* 1-10.) Here we have a statement which reveals to us a glorious mission of Jesus, the most blessed we could desire. Never was this said of any one else in the same sense in which Paul said it of Jesus.

We have here, further, a very definite statement. And on a subject such as this we need no guess work; no mere supposition; no uncertainty. With Joseph Cook, every serious man says: "Give me no guess for a dying pillow." No, no. We want certainty; and though the light of reason on this subject leads us with some degree of certainty into the dark valley of death, yet we need clearer light, more encouraging light, before we can be satisfied. This light we have in Christ Jesus our Lord. "To make the valley luminous, and to empower us to behold with an unwavering confidence the radiant home on the farther side, a light 'that never shone on land or sea' must come to us. The opened heavens alone can give it. The truth must be revealed, not argued out." The truth has been revealed, for it "hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

Two facts are here stated:

(a.) Jesus Christ brought life to light, and (b.) He brought immortality to light. For we do not think that the phrase "life and immortality" is used by hendiadys. We believe that two distinct things are meant by the expression; the first, life, meaning salvation or a life given by Jesus to the believer; a life which is to extend beyond this life—a spiritual life of the soul which dies not with the body; a spiritual life, which, (though it is, indeed, endless) does not imply endlessness; a life which is in God. Is not this the life which Christ meant when He said: "Father the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." (*John* 17: 1-3.) Did this mean a mere "endless" life? As Canon Farrar says, "The life—if mere living be life—of the most doomed and apostate of the human race—the life even of the devil and his angels—is an endless living, if we hold that man and evil spirits are immortal." ("Early Days of Christianity" p. 511). Christ came to reveal more than the mere fact of an "endless"

life,—a life of unbroken continuance—but a life having ethical quality; a life which is given to man by Christ through the revelation which He made of God, revealing God in His Universal Fatherhood, and love and grace, so that men might know Him in His blessed relationship to them as their Father, Helper Protector, Bountiful Benefactor, and not as their Almighty Creator only. Now to know God as such is life eternal, for it causes one to trust in God; hold communion with Him in confident fellowship; to look to Him for life and help. And *never would man have known God was such a God, if Christ had not brought this all to light.* From unaided reason we would never learn to know God as such; from philosophy we never could learn it; science surely does not teach Him to us as such; and Nature is ominously silent as far as God's moral attributes are concerned. Hence could we ever have attained unto spiritual life without it having been brought to light through Christ the Lord? *Never.* But in Christ we have this life revealed.

(b.) But Paul says further that Jesus always brought immortality to light. That is, not only that there is a spiritual life but that there is a life immortal—in other words, that the soul of man never dies.

Now the first question that presents itself is this: Can we not know of the immortality of the soul without the revelation which Jesus made of it? In other words, was it necessary that Christ should bring immortality to light? And the second question is: In what sense then did Jesus Christ bring immortality to light?

Let us attend to these two questions; and if we find that even before the advent of Christ, men believed in the immortality of the soul, and now without the revelation of immortality which Jesus brought to light, are confidently persuaded that they are immortal, then added to this the revelation of Christ, we claim that we have a demonstration of it which amounts to almost a mathematical certainty. Any one doubting after this the immortality of the soul, would not believe were one to arise from the dead and declare it to be true.

(1). Did men know before the advent of Christ that they were immortal?

How was it with the O. T. saints? Did they have this doctrine in their creed? We are told sometimes that the O. T. does not state the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and that the ancient people of God did not hold to the doctrine. It is true that the O. T. does not state the doctrine formally; but this does not imply that therefore the people did not possess the belief in it, any more than that because the doctrine of the Being of God is not formally stated in the O. T., they did not believe in the existence of God. All through the O. T. it is implied that God is, and it needed not to be formally stated. Just so is it implied all through the O. T., that there is a future life, and therefore no formal statement of the doctrine was necessary.

What meant the translation of Enoch to them, if not that he continued to live? What meant Elijah's going up *into heaven*, if not a future existence for him? What meant David's statement about his child that died: "I can go to him, but he cannot return to me," if not a continued personal existence hereafter? This may be interpreted to mean that he was to go to the grave where his child was. But would this have been the comfort to him which we find the saying to have been? What comfort would the silent tomb where lay his child afford him, when his dead body would be laid by its side? Does his expression not imply that he, at least, believed in a future life, where friends would meet friends, and where relationships, broken by death, would be restored?

And then, further, in the words of Dr. Hodge: "That the Hebrews, God's chosen people, the recipients and custodians of a supernatural revelation, should be the only nation on the face of the earth in whose religion the doctrine of a future state had no place, would be a solecism. It is absolutely incredible, for it supposes human nature in the case of the Hebrews to be radically different from what it is in other men."—(*Sys. Theol. vol. III., p. 716*). Nay, their whole history implies that they

believed in a future state. Their ideas of the destiny of man, more exalted than those of any other nation; their high conceptions of the nature of man; their aspirations; their hopes; their aims; their words—all very plainly bespeak a belief in a future state.

But let us ask now, can men who are not the custodians of a supernatural revelation know of the immortality of the soul, without a revelation of it? This leads us to consider the arguments for the doctrine not based on revelation. Are these sufficient to satisfy us that there is a future state? Let us see.

(a). We can prove the doctrine true *first*, from its *universality*. Dr. Hodge says: "The mass of men whose convictions on such subjects are founded on their moral and religious nature, have in all ages believed in the continued existence of the soul after death." (*Sys. Theol.*, vol. III., p. 715.) The religions of all civilized peoples contain the doctrine. Emerson says that "as soon as a man begins to think seriously, he finds in his soul some belief in the life beyond life; that there never was a time when the doctrine of a future life was not held; that the belief in immortality is elemental; and that the Master of the Universe has built it in the structure of our minds." *

This belief is universal not only among people who live within the pale of Bible influence, but it is also held by those who are utterly destitute of a revelation of it. "The expectation of existence after death is an organic or constitutional instinct." (*Joseph Cook*, "*Biology*," p. 288).

Now, we ask, *how came this belief to be innate in the soul of mankind, if there is nothing of the kind existing in reality?* To leave man hungering after immortality "would be to put into his mouth the valid plaint and bitter lamentation—that He who made the human soul, made it to be hungry, and yet so placed it that it could not possibly obtain bread." God never created a desire merely to mock it.

* See an excellent review of Emerson on "The Immortality of the Soul," in *Baptist Quarterly* for April, 1876, by Prof. S. M. Shute.

But again, have you never on some beautiful, quiet summer evening rode on the placid lake, unrippled even by a gentle summer's zephyr, and looking into the water, beheld as if deep down in its bosom, the moon in all its silvery beauty? You knew that that was but a reflection. You knew also that that reflection could not have been there, had there not been a real moon shining above you from a clear sky. Now, as we look down into the depths of man's soul, we behold clearly and unmistakably a reflection of immortality. How came this reflection there if there was nothing to be reflected? Can we have a shadow without a substance to cast a shadow? This we have, if there is no future state.

(b). We have further, the fact that everything pertaining to man's soul, points to a continued existence.

"There shine through all our earthly dresse,
Bright shoots of everlastingness."

Can we think that the vast possibilities of soul which lie in alluring prospect before us, will end with this life which is but a span, but a moment compared with eternity? The longer a man lives, the more does he find prospects opening before him, and beckoning him on; and when the last days and hours of his earthly life are reached, the sentiment of his heart is that he is about to begin to live. For the prospects for continued existence at the end of his earthly life are more definite than ever before, and he then begins to realize as he never realized it before, that "a man is not completely born until he has passed through death." Nay, there is such a "clear want of adequacy in the present exquisite arrangement of things, to completely satisfy the longings of the spirit," that we cannot but look forward to an immortal life, and an eternity for the soul.

Now, the argument is this: whence all this feeling, this outlook, this realization, if there is no reality of it? How account for it all? Say not it came from tradition of father to son, and that men are educated up to this feeling. For it exists where no traditional beliefs of it are held; it is innate in man's soul.

(c). But again, when the body dies the *man* does not—the soul never ages with the body. “We have already, several times over, lost a great part, or perhaps the whole of our body, according to certain common established laws of nature; yet we remain the same living agents: when we shall lose as great a part, or the whole, by another common established law of nature, death, why may we not also remain the same?” (*Butler, “Analogy,” chap. 1.*)

(d). From the analogy of nature, as Bishop Butler quite conclusively shows, we can confidently conclude that there is a future state. At all events, we learn from it that it is, at least, probable that we may survive the various changes which we have undergone, and those which we know we may undergo without being destroyed, and exist in a future state and perception—(*See his 1st chapter in “Analogy”*) and though there is an antecedent improbability of a future life of the soul, it may be a fact, just as much as, although there is an antecedent improbability that the prone, offensive worm, “should be clothed with the beauty of gaudy colors, be instinct with life, leave the earth, soar at pleasure in a new element, take its rank in a new order of beings, be divested of all that was offensive and loathsome in its old abode in the eyes of other beings, and be completely dissociated from all the plans, habits, relations and feelings of its former lowly condition,” yet this, as we know, is a fact.

We see then, that laying aside any revelation of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, there are strong, convincing arguments in its favor, which, to an unprejudiced mind, are conclusive.

What then does Paul mean when he says that Jesus Christ has brought immortality to light? In view of the fact that we can know of the immortality of the soul without an objective revelation from God concerning it, it is an interesting and pertinent question to ask in what sense did Paul mean that Jesus Christ brought immortality to light?

(2). Let us try and answer this question.

We answer, in establishing the fact beyond the peradventure of a doubt; in removing all doubt about it; and especially in revealing unto the world what that immortality is. To know *that* a thing is, is often very blessed and desirable; but very often this is but an annoyance, and productive of distressing anxiety and trembling solicitude. To make the knowledge which we possess that a thing is, encouraging and satisfying, we must, in many cases, know also *what* it is. For example, we may know that God is the Almighty Creator of all things; that He is holy, pure, just, benevolent, omniscient, omnipotent. But this knowledge may only cause us to fear and tremble, seeing that we are but mere creatures of a day, sinful, impure, unholy. But when we know together with the former, also *what* God is—a God of love and grace and mercy and long-suffering, a *Father*, we rejoice in our knowledge, we are encouraged by it.

Now, we may know that the soul is immortal, yet the knowledge of this fact in itself is not encouraging, does not necessarily produce hope and joy—aye, on the contrary, this may produce anxiety, a feeling of uncertainty. It has done this. "But now it is time for us to go away, I to die, you to live. Which of us is going to the better fate is unknown to all save God." With these uncertain feelings Socrates closed his *Apology* ("*Socrates.*" *Scribner & Sons*, p. 50, 1883.) Even he who never once doubted the fact of his immortality, trembled because of his uncertainty in regard to what his future life should be.

To remove all doubt, to dispel all fear, to prevent any misgivings, Jesus Christ came to bring immortality to light through the gospel—in other words, He came to reveal not only that there is a "life beyond life," but—and this is the distinctive mission of Jesus in regard to this—to tell *what* that future life is. And in that sense has Jesus Christ "brought life and immortality to light."

How did He do this ?

(a). *By giving distinct declarations concerning the future life.*

Alger, who belongs to the class of so-called Liberal Christians says: "Christ once reasoned with the Sadducees 'as touching the dead that they rise;' in other words, that the souls of men upon the decease of the body pass into another and an unending state of existence: 'Neither can they die any more; for they are equal with the angels, and are the children of the resurrection.' His argument was, that God is the God of the living, not of the dead, that is, the spiritual nature of man involves such a relationship with God as pledges His attributes to its perpetuity. The thought which supports the reasoning penetrates far into the soul, and grasps the moral relations between man and God. It is most interesting, viewed as the unqualified affirmation by Jesus of the doctrine of a future life which shall be deathless." (*See Hodge's Sys. Theol. Vol. III. p. 719-720*).

We have further the beautiful passage in John 14: 1-3, where Jesus says: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me. *In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto Myself; that where I am ye may be also.*"

This tender, affectionate passage, coming as it were, from the dying lips of the Saviour, has hallowed many a dying bed; has removed the sting of death from many a soul; has robbed the grave of its terror for many a trusting child of God; has encouraged many a trembling believer to enter freely and joyfully into the dark valley; and has empowered him to behold, with unclouded vision the radiant home on the other side of the valley. And well might it. For it reveals in language distinct, unmistakable what the believer's future life is—it is a going home, to enjoy for ever and ever the fellowship and communion of Jesus his Saviour, in a home with God, and a companionship of glorified saints and purified spirits. Now, such

an immortality did Jesus come to bring to light. To know of such an immortality we needed more than the mere affirmations of reason.

Emerson, guided by the light of reason and feeling only, says, "We may feel the immortality of the mind, as it were, by touching."

Yes, we may. But we cannot know of a "home of the soul"; we cannot know of the blessedness of that home, and of the fellowship with the Redeemer and redeemed, and holy angels, from our feelings alone. We needed a revelation of this, clear, distinct, full. And this we have in Jesus Christ who hath "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." What a blessed light it is that illumines the dark valley! How cheering, how soul-satisfying! This light guides one *home*!

"'Heimgang!' So the German people,
Whisper when they hear the bell
Tolling from some gray old steeple
Death's familiar tale to tell.
When they hear the organ dirges
Swelling out from chapel dome,
And the singers chanting surges,
'Heimgang!' Always going home.

'Heimgang!' Quaint and tender saying
In the grand old German tongue,
That has shaped Melancthon's praying,
And the hymns that Luther sung;
Blessed is our loving Maker,
That where'er our feet shall roam,
Still we journey towards 'God's acre'—
'Heimgang!' Always going home.

'Heimgang!' We are all so weary,
And the willows as they wave,
Softly sighing, sweetly, dreary,
Woo us to the tranquil grave.
When the golden pitcher's broken
With its dregs and with its foam,
And the tender words are spoken,
'Heimgang!' We are going home."

(c.) Jesus, further, brought immortality to light by *His resurrection*.

His resurrection is a fact. Even De Wette, who is styled the "Universal Doubter" says of it: "The fact of the resurrection, although a darkness which cannot be dissipated rests on the way and manner of it, cannot itself be called into doubt," any more, adds Joseph Cook, than the historical certainty of the assassination of Caesar. Mr. Cook says that "this is the passage over which Neander, the famous church historian, shed tears when he read it." (*Biology*, p. 305.) If the resurrection of Jesus is a fact, then, although the way and manner of it may be clouded and dark, we have enough to persuade us of the absolute certainty of a future life. Upon the fact of a risen Christ is based the hope, according to the teachings of the Apostles, of eternal life. (See *Schaff-Herzog Ency. of Rel. Knowledge*, Vol. I, p. 759.) "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished" (1 Cor. 15: 17, 18.) Christ is spoken of as having risen from the dead, thus becoming the first fruits of them that slept. (1 Cor. 15: 20.) And why did Christ rise? Because He was to put *all* enemies under His feet; and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. (1 Cor. 15: 25, 26.) He arose that all believers in Him might rise. In the resurrection of Jesus the believer has a pledge of his own resurrection. "Christ," says Dr. Hodge "has not only risen, but He has risen in a representative character. His resurrection is the pledge of the resurrection of His people. He rose as *the first fruits of them that slept*, and not of them only, but as the first fruits of all who are ever to sleep in Jesus." (*Commen. on 1 Cor. 15: 20*.) This, surely, is bringing life and immortality to light very clearly. Who can doubt it, therefore, any longer? He who doubts it after this revelation of it, would doubt it should a voice from heaven audibly proclaim it in his hearing. And should this happen it would add nothing whatever to the weight of the convincing testimony which we have from reason, feeling and Jesus Christ. Yes, the flood-gates of heaven were opened,

and streams of overwhelming light were poured in upon the soul through Jesus Christ, the Lord, revealing the blessed state of the immortality of the believing child of God, for "Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." What more can man wish?

VI.

THE BEGINNINGS OF OUR LITERARY INSTITUTIONS.

BY REV. FRANKLIN K. LEVAN, A. M.

SECOND PAPER.

THE object of our first paper was to make clear some of the fundamental conditions that were at hand among the Germans and their descendants in Pennsylvania and adjacent states, during the first century and a quarter of their settlement, influencing favorably and unfavorably the establishment of literary institutions of a higher order by them or by their aid. We sought to confine ourselves to such conditions as were general, unavoidable, and of sufficient force, powerfully to tell one way or the other. By thus reproducing the main features of the situation in the life, principles, wants and thoughts of that period we may hope to do ourselves the service of enabling us to judge the past according to truth, and to render justice to the memory of our forefathers.

Every particular literary institution, in its history, exemplifies practically the state of things existing at the time, and verifies the general facts which have been stated. But a history of all or of any one of them, comprehending whatever is really essential, and leaving out pretty much all that is unessential, it would be difficult to write. Much preliminary work it would

seem ought first to be done. A mass of unessential facts lie on the surface, and obtrude themselves; while not a few of the essential facts lie measurably hidden, and have as yet found slight consideration, or been greatly misunderstood. It would be as different from the histories on the subject commonly written, as Green's History of the English People is different from an ordinary History of England.

The object of the present paper will be to bring out into some prominence some of the overlooked or misunderstood facts, relating to the beginnings of a few of the literary institutions, established by the Germans and their descendants, or by their help, during the time in question. And it is rather distinctness of certain facts, than completeness of history, that we aim at.

First in the order of time comes :

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

As none other in the State is this institution the creature of the people of our great metropolis and of the whole commonwealth. And, being such, we might infer, *a priori*, that the Germans and their descendants, contributing as they have from the first, so very large and intelligent a percentage of the population, both of Philadelphia and of Pennsylvania, must have had a good share in its rise, growth and prosperity. With this inference the facts in the case, upon examination, will be found to correspond. Of its origin the following statement is given by Day in his "Historical Collections of Pennsylvania," pp. 580-81.

"Education commenced at an early date in Philadelphia. Mr. Proud tells us that in 1683 Enoch Flower, from Wiltshire, taught reading, writing and arithmetic, at eight shillings per quarter; and in 1689 a public school was established by the Society of Friends, but open to all, which received in 1711, a charter from Wm. Penn. * George Keith, from Aberdeen, a

* This school is still in existence and flourishing. In August, 1883, we

man of learning, and famous in Quaker history for his polemical character, was the first teacher.

In 1749 a subscription was set on foot by a number of gentlemen of the city, among whom were Thomas Hopkinson, Tench Francis, Richard Peters, and Benjamin Franklin, to establish an Academy and Charitable School, which was opened the following year for instruction in the Latin and English languages, and Mathematics. It was incorporated in 1753, and the proprietaries endowed it with money and lands amounting to £3000. Lindley Murray, the grammarian, was a pupil of this college. Rev. Wm. Smith, was appointed Principal; Rev. Francis Allison, Master of the Latin School. The institution soon grew into a college by an act of incorporation in 1755, under the title of The College, Academy and Charitable School of Philadelphia. Rev. Dr. Smith was elected Provost, and the same year degrees were conferred upon six pupils."

"Dr. Smith, the Provost, was an able and learned man, and had been very efficient in procuring funds for it in Europe; yet he was suspected of not being very favorable to a separation from Great Britain; and being strongly attached to the church of England, the more ardent Whigs, and some of the Presbyterians, who were Whigs to a man, determined to remove him from office, much against the judgment of the friends of the institution. The old provincial charter was abrogated, and a new institution, The University of Pennsylvania, was chartered by the State Legislature in 1779, and endowed with the property of the old college and with the confiscated property of

noticed in the Philadelphia "Times," in large letters, the following advertisement:

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL.

THE OLDEST EXISTING CHARTERED SCHOOL IN AMERICA. FOUNDED 1689.
CHARTERED BY PENN 1711.

As will be seen later on, the Germans in Philadelphia and vicinity were either not united enough or else not wise enough at that early day to follow the example of their Quaker neighbors in founding an institution that might continually live and prosper until now.

F. R. L.

Tories. Rev. Dr. John Ewing, the senior Presbyterian clergyman in the State, was chosen Provost.

In the list of first Trustees of the College we find the name of Robert Strettell; and in 1765 Dr. Adam Kuhn was Professor of Botany. The names of both these gentlemen show their nationality.

The act of November 27th, 1779, chartering the University, restored the old privileges of the College, as well as added large properties of loyalists or tories, and expressly provided that all religious denominations should have equal rights in the institution. It was, however, only in 1785, that the confiscated real estate of loyalists began to bring in revenue. By law the whole income was not to exceed £1500 sterling, counting the bushel of wheat at 10 shillings. The revenue now amounted to £1381 sterling. The same act of Legislature provided also for a German Professorship in the learned languages, and for as many German Tutors as might be required.

"The Board of Trustees consisted of the principal officers of the State, the judges and the oldest ministers of all the churches in Philadelphia. By means of these pastors, entitled to membership and vote, their congregations were to be represented. In accordance with this provision the Rev. John Christopher Kunze, then pastor of the German Lutheran Zion's congregation in Philadelphia, was one of them; also a member of the executive committee; and soon afterward elected German Professor of Philology, with a salary equal to that which he received from his charge. He was to teach the languages and science of his department in German. As soon as the number of his pupils reached thirty, a tutor was to be appointed as assistant to him. This happened soon; and his colleague in the pastorate, Helmuth, became Kunze's assistant in teaching. They both taught German, Latin and Greek; but Hebrew, Kunze, as Professor of the Oriental Languages, taught alone, two hours every week. The number of their scholars at times exceeded forty. German was studied so zealously then, that Helmuth, in a letter to Dr. G. A. Freylinghausen, in Halle,

dated March 13th, 1782, gives expression to the joyful hope, that 'in a few years Philadelphia would look more like a German than an English city.' In August, 1784, Kunze took the pastorate of the German Lutheran congregation in New York, the oldest German congregation there, which had been founded already in the time of the Dutch supremacy. His colleague, Helmuth, was now unanimously elected by the Trustees of the University, Professor of Philology; but not of Oriental Languages, a position which Kunze had likewise held, though he often had not more than six students. In the autumn of 1784, the two sons of the German Reformed pastor* of the city were also placed under the German instructions of Helmuth. These were the first Reformed children in attendance, and were soon followed by others."†

In this connection we cannot forego the pleasure of quoting a sketch of the first public exhibition of the German class of the University, which took place about this time. It is a picture of the early day.

"The audience consisted of the members of the State Government, the City Council, the Magistrates, the Trustees of the University, the entire Faculty, the German Society, and many other prominent persons. The German Society had secured the music, which, at intervals, agreeably entertained the audience. In opening, Helmuth made an English prayer. This was followed by one of the scholars with an English address, in which he thanked the Trustees for their interest in the German population, shown in the establishment of the German professorship. One of the young students explained, in the German language, the arrangements of the school. Two, likewise in German, explained to those present the discovery of a planet, and life upon it—a moral allegory. Another pictured in German verses, the Final Judgment. Another, also in Ger-

* Children of the Rev. Dr. Casper Dietrich Weyberg, for twenty six years (from 1763 to 1790) pastor of the First German Reformed church in Philadelphia.

F. K. L.

† Dr. Braun's *Mittheilungen aus Nordamerika*, Braunschweig, 1829. pp. 228-230.

man, verses, the Greatness of God. Hereupon four speakers followed with a colloquy, in German, concerning Ghosts and Witchcraft, one of them describing the late discovery of Animal Magnetism. Three others discoursed with each other on Religious Toleration; and three represented Farmers' Children, one of whom had been two years at school, and instructed the others in matters of which they were ignorant. This by way of encouragement to the wealthier German people to give their children a better education. Dr. Helmuth, as a member of the German Society, made an address, and the Provost closed with a prayer in English. The whole audience remained to the close, and showed hearty satisfaction with the promising culture and lively manners of the German Students who received general praise." *

Public interest now set in strongly in favor of the German department of the University. In October, 1781, there were forty-two students in it; by April, the following year, sixty. The Trustees were so well pleased that they transferred the German division to the larger and more convenient hall, its numbers being half-again the greater, and the English division to the smaller hall, at first intended for the other. Many children of prominent English families attended the German classes, and three Tutors were appointed.

But times were bad and grew worse. Towards the close of the Revolutionary War the Continental currency was sadly depreciated, somewhat like Confederate currency toward the close of our late Civil War. The University shared the common misfortune. Pupils were numerous enough, but funds, with which to pay the professors, were wanting. If three hundred dollars were due, the claimant received eighty, or forty, or nothing, according to circumstances. The book-publisher, Steiner, to relieve the difficulty somewhat, offered to Dr. Kunze and his assistant, Dr. Helmuth, two hundred dollars each, for editing his German paper; an offer which they felt constrained to accept. So they both were, at the same time, pastors of a

* Braun's Mittheilungen. p. 230-31.

large congregation, professors of nigh half-a-dozen languages in the University, and editors of a German secular paper; the remuneration from these several sources affording them, no doubt, a very modest living and nothing more. It was an heroic work, well done.

After the close of the war the Trustees appropriated annually twenty-four hundred dollars in gold to the German department of the University. The number of students rose to seventy. And in acknowledgment of the public services, in many ways, of the German ministers of the several denominations in Philadelphia, and because a number of children were educated free of expense, the state Government, in 1785, made a donation of five thousand acres of land to the Charity School or German department of the University. But we cannot pursue the history of this particular institution any further in this connection; nor would it be to the purpose we have in view to do so. Enough, however, has been shown, we think, to justify the following observations:

1. According to the charter of the University of Pennsylvania all denominations, which had churches in Philadelphia, were as such, at first, and for a long time in its history, entitled to representation in the Board of Trustees; and with probably some modifications, such may be the case yet. This included the German bodies—the Lutheran and the Reformed. They were actually thus represented, and that for years. So explicit was the privilege, and so general the understanding of it, that a failure to use the favor conferred would have arrested public attention, and doubtless led to public complaint. The removal of Rev. Dr. Smith from the Provostship of the College was not simply brought about because of his leaning to the Tory side of the political questions of the day, but also because he, and a majority of the Directors, had attempted, as it was charged, in 1764, by means of a by-law, to bring it under the control of the Episcopal Church. Hence the new charter of 1779 made the express provision in favor of all the denominations. As it was founded for the benefit of all the people, it was to be legally under the control of those who represented all classes of the people.

2. It was the original intention and habit to have the Faculty made up in good part—say, in proportion to their population—of ministers and scholars from the German Churches. Kuhn, Kunze and Helmuth are examples. And we have seen with what zeal they engaged in their work, under what self-denials they carried it forward, and what success crowned it.

3. The German population of Philadelphia and vicinity, from the beginning, took a hearty interest in the University, and furnished a large percentage of the students; at times more than one-half of the whole number in attendance. And this interest ran through all classes of German society. The sons of ministers and the sons of the people were alike among the students.

4. All this was not a concession. It was both a right and a necessity. In its early history Philadelphia was, in fact, almost as much a German as an English city. To say nothing of German book-publishers like Steiner, Sauer and others, Franklin himself, in his capacity as publisher, issued nearly as many works in German as in English. And so it ran through all trades—an unmistakable evidence of the composition of the population as to nationality. Philadelphia was then what we now would call a small city, say somewhat similar to the present city of Reading. Nigh one-half of the number must have been Germans and their descendants. So they had inherent rights, to be secured in the charter, to an institution of the kind that was mainly established by public funds; and if it was to be filled with students, and so answer the object of its establishment, it was necessary that the Germans—that is, the Lutherans, the Reformed and others—should furnish, as they also did, a very large proportion. The community at large felt the demand for an institution furnishing the means for the acquisition of a general higher education; all were invited to take part in its establishment, and to all equal rights in the administration of its affairs; and equal privileges in the use of the facilities it furnished were secured. Excepting the Quakers, it seems that no nationality, or denomination, felt as yet prepared, in its separate

capacity, to undertake the founding and running of a higher literary institution. It was thus the peculiar circumstances, in which the people of Philadelphia, at the time, found themselves, that gave to their great University the distinctive character, in this respect, which from the first has marked it. It did not meet all wants, as was soon manifest; nor could it do so. It met, however, those wants most common to all; and only them. Special wants growing out of race, religion or locality were left to be provided for at a later day and in other ways.

It may not be uninteresting to cast a glance, in passing, at the relation of the Germans to the cause of higher liberal education in the neighboring state of New York, in the early days of the Republic; more especially to their connection with the founding of what was then called—

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Very soon after the first permanent settlements made by the Dutch, the Germans' also began to settle, and in growing numbers, on the territory on which New York city has since been built. Some dwelt in the town, engaged in its various avocations; others, up the island in the country; and the present Bowery was the main road that led from the homes of the former to the *Bauereien* of the latter. Already under the Dutch rule the German Lutherans had established a congregation. How early the first German Reformed Church in the city was organized, we have not the data hand to say, though we think it must have been some considerable time before the Revolution. For the Coetal Minutes of 1773 state that in 1772 the Rev. John Daniel Gross had left his charge in East Pennsylvania, and accepted a call to the German Reformed congregation in New York city. And it does not appear as though it were a new interest. Of this congregation the well known revolutionary general, Baron von Steuben, became a member, and an active officer. He made his influence to be felt for good in many ways among his countrymen. Through his active efforts the German Society, having for its object the co-opera-

tion, culture and elevation of the German people, was founded toward the close of the war, and in many ways it rendered efficient service toward the ends contemplated in its establishment.

When, at the close of the war, the University of the State of New York was founded in the city of that name, the Germans seem to have gone hand-in-hand with the English and the Dutch in its support. The state had furnished the charter; the people were to see to the obtaining of funds and students. One clause of the charter was as follows; and strongly reminds one of the numerous makeshifts yet employed in our day:

"In case any congregation, or individual members, of any denomination, shall secure to the University at least 200 bushels of wheat annually as a salary, they shall be elected a professor of theology of the confession to which the donors and the person designated by them belong.*

It was this provision which led Dr. Kunze, in 1784, to exchange his position in Philadelphia for the one in New York. The want of ministers had come to be greatly felt among the German churches. The University in Philadelphia allowed no room for teaching theology of any kind; that in New York left free room for all who furnished the specified amount of funds. The German Lutheran congregation, for one, it was thought, would meet this condition, and then called Dr. Kunze to fill the double position of pastor and professor of theology. Professor of oriental languages † more particularly he was made, and also one of the Regents. Honor, plenty. But the

* Braun's Mittheilungen, p. 233.

† It appears that the Lutheran congregation did after all not furnish the requisite "200 bushels of wheat," enabling it to secure a professorship of theology. Hence its representative was made, what he had been in Philadelphia, namely, Professor of oriental languages. Nearly all the other denominations, probably, came short in like manner; so there was no crowding of theological professors, nor confusion of theological teachings. Two hundred bushels of wheat must have been a great thing at that time. However, if the students had been forthcoming, we doubt not the wheat could also have been had.

actual reception of salary was conditioned by the attendance of students, and for a whole year none offered themselves in this department. So he employed his spare time in improving his knowledge of Hebrew and Arabic. Dr. Livingstone, professor of theology, representing the Dutch Reformed Church, however, encouraged him somewhat with the promise that he would transfer his students in Hebrew, all beginners yet, to his care. Dr. Kunze was very anxious to make this University in New York a means for educating young men for the ministry in the Lutheran Church, and the charter gave to him, as to others, full freedom to do this, if students would come to attend his lectures. But here was the difficulty. He was building at the top, while the walls from the foundation were not going up among his people.

On the German Reformed side the representative seems to have been the Rev. Dr. Gross, who taught in the University, and filled the position of pastor of the congregation in the city, belonging to this denomination, at the same time. He published a text book on theology, which was the result of lectures delivered during the period he occupied his professorship.

Dr. Brauns, in his *Mittheilungen*, page 234, says:

"Among the Regents of the University in New York the leading Israelite Rabbi, Gershom Sexas, holds also membership. The other members consist of the Mayor of the city, the leading government officers, the most prominent ministers, the president of the institution, together with several doctors of medicine and attorneys-at-law."

Let us notice here a few facts:

1. New York at this time was a city somewhat smaller than Philadelphia. To establish even the beginning of a university the whole population had to be invoked, and as in the sister city, measures had to be proposed which would appeal to the separate interests of the different classes of inhabitants. The New Yorkers offered a wider scope by including theology in their possible curriculum, but with practical foresight they made a corresponding *quid pro quo* an indispensable condition.

2. These incidental wants were not met by the contemplated provision. Nothing permanent in the way of theological teaching ever grew out of it. These wants were separate and distinct, and could not be thus merged. Soon afterward they asserted themselves in an independent form, and had force enough within them to lead to the establishment of institutions that could do them full justice.

FRANKLIN COLLEGE.

This institution was founded at Lancaster, Pa., in the year 1787. It was established especially in the interest, and for the benefit of the German population. The ownership of two-thirds of it was to rest with the Lutheran and the Reformed denominations; the remaining third was held for outsiders. The state legislature endowed it with the gift of 10,000 acres of land. At the beginning the citizens of Lancaster subscribed the sum of £1,000 sterling in its behalf. Private individuals donated a roomy building for school purposes, and several building lots. The aim of the institution was: A proper study of the German and English languages, also of the classical languages; Mathematics, Ethics, Natural Science, Theology, and such other branches of knowledge as are calculated to make good and useful citizens. The following five professors constituted the Faculty:

Dr. Gotthilf Henry Ernst Muhlenburg, German Lutheran pastor in Lancaster, Principal.

Dr. William Hendel, German Reformed pastor in Lancaster, Vice-Principal.

Frederick Valentine Melsheimer, Instructor in the German, Latin and Greek languages.

Reichenbach, Professor of Mathematics.

Hutchins, the Presbyterian pastor, Professor of the English language and Belles Lettres.

With such an equipment of lands, money, and professors, one might suppose Franklin College ought to have prospered. Far

from it, however. As to how matters did actually go, we may see from Braun's *Mittheilungen*, chapter XX. It will be seen that the author is a pretty strong partisan himself. Nevertheless he plainly enough indicates these existing difficulties and feelings, whether he judges their relative merits correctly or not. Speaking of this college he says:

"An unfortunate institution, which, already in the year following its founding, came to naught. Instead of all the Germans uniting to support by every means at hand, the excellent and most praiseworthy, highest German institution in Philadelphia,* envy and jealousy toward Dr. Helmuth, who was equally great as an educator and a teacher of religion, led, as I have often heard, to the establishment of a crippled higher literary institution in the country town of Lancaster. It might have been foreseen that such an institution in that town, out in the country, would as little prosper as a German publishing house in Kamschatka. Sown by those envious and jealous of the most worthy and distinguished teachers of the German Evangelical Church in America, the sad seed of Franklin College brought forth nothing but dead fruit, and ended as might have been expected. In consequence of that Franklin college movement, the German school and church interests of America have received a severe blow. Whenever—after its single year's crippled life, and subsequent self-dissolution—an effort was made in favor of higher German education, the refrain always was: "Whatever is distinctively German cannot thrive in America; we American-born Germans stand a grade above our forefathers, who came from the fatherland; we must adapt

* By this is not meant the German department in the university of Pennsylvania, but a high grade German school in Philadelphia, projected by Drs. Kunze and Helmuth, of the Lutheran Church, and possibly Dr. Weyberg of the Reformed church, who, as is well known, was an intimate friend of Helmuth. The parochial schools of the different congregations in the city, were to be the basis, and this projected higher German institution was to carry such as had aspirations, of the kind, on to a larger culture and to the professions. Especially was it hoped thus to become able to respond to the pressing growing necessity for more German ministers of the Gospel. The project was well meant, enthusiastically presented, but never came to bear much living fruit.

ourselves to the English culture, which is more up to the times, and meets our wants better." According to the assertion of some who ought to know, the establishment of Franklin College—as also later the English Reformed Seminary in Carlisle, and the English Lutheran Seminary in Gettysburg—had no other object than this: the speedier to Anglicise the Germans in America. This unfortunate plan, as also the ostensible one of maintaining the German language in America, and of elevating and cultivating the German people here, failed for the simple reason that it was misconceived. If those 10,000 acres of land, given by the government to Franklin College at Lancaster, had been given to the German institution in Philadelphia, what valuable results other than that sickly, early defunct college, would have been reached. But for Lancaster stronger influences were at work in the Legislature than for Philadelphia. . . . Family interests are stronger than State interests, as in monarchies, so in democracies. This is made very plain by that unfortunate Franklin College at Lancaster.

Enough said. There was evidently a party in Philadelphia and another party in the counties outside, both professing to be the friends of the German interests of that day, both active and influential, both probably perfectly sincere too, and yet utterly unable to unite on common measures and means to secure the praiseworthy ends they alike had in view. More than that; the difference of policies to accomplish common objects led to crimination and recrimination, until the friends, who had become contestants, grew weary, worn and exhausted, and the good cause they championed in such an unseemly fashion, suffered a relapse for a full quarter of a century. And when a new beginning was made, it had to be in an entirely different form, and with the disadvantage of the discomfiture, prostration and apathy which had intervened.

We close this second paper with the following observations.

1. The German settlers of the Middle States were, from the first, among the most active in seeking to establish literary institutions of a higher order with a view to keep up with the ad-

vanced civilization and culture of the modern world. They had no idea of sinking themselves or allowing their children to sink, into a semi-barbarism in this western hemisphere. No history of the educational movements in the early days of the colonies can be just, and yet withhold from them and their services a large share of praise. They were not obstructionists, nor indifferentists, but positive, active aiders, helpers in men, means, and students, in legislative councils and in public efforts. Their pastors were naturally, in the main, their leaders; and of the Reformed and Lutheran ministers of the time, it must be said, in this respect, that they were guides, of whose record any people might be proud.

2. It was natural that the first attempts should be made, not single-handed, but by concert of all the nationalities and denominations. Such was felt to be the necessity by so wise and practical a man as Franklin, and hence his active work in this direction. The population, as a whole, was small, the means were limited, the obstacles were great and manifold. Separately, each could do little; unitedly they might do something of account. And so it proved. The University of Pennsylvania and the University of the State of New York were not failures. They did a good work from the beginning. All nationalities and all denominations here represented reaped rich benefits from their influence. They could, however, not do everything, nor all things that their friends at first supposed they might do. There were just denominational interests—Reformed, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal and others—which it was gradually found they could not meet; and the Germans had peculiar wants for which they could not make adequate provision. As this was ascertained some discouragement was felt, and some dissatisfaction shown. But it could not be helped. The legitimate sphere of these institutions became clearer, and they had to go on in it. The joint meeting of the distinct wants of all the denominations had to be given up. Different nationalities could not at the same time have all their rightful demands answered. For them new channels, separate

channels had to be sought. The day was rapidly coming when other literary institutions had also to be founded, just as legitimate, and doing the work left hitherto undone.

3. Doubtless to the failure of the institutions named to meet certain comprehensive, felt wants we have to look for the actual cause which led to the founding of Franklin College at Lancaster. It was not personal interests, nor local interests, as Dr. Brauns intimates: who again echoes the sentiments of others of earlier date. That charge belongs to the smaller ammunition of the controversies which arose at the time. The statesmen who endowed Franklin College liberally for that period, and the prime movers in its establishment, were little influenced by such considerations. They had other ends in view than the gratification of personal jealousy and envy, no matter who cherished them. We look upon the founding of Franklin College as a step forward; an honest effort to enable the Germans to have an institution of learning of their own, constituted so as to meet the wants which were peculiar to themselves, unhampered by the effort to meet at the same time peculiarities characteristic of other nationalities; and, also, to secure a firm basis on which the Reformed and the Lutheran denominations might make provision for the theological training of their on-coming ministry. In order to do all this the more effectually, the German inland town of Lancaster, in which and in the country around which both churches were strong, was chosen. The plan must have looked exceedingly plausible. The tribes could not all work together on all points; let them separate in a measure; and let those nearest akin, having the most matters in common, join in their efforts. That was the idea. The Germans might go on at Lancaster, the Scotch at Princeton, others at other places. This second stage had been reached. Some might succeed well; some badly. That would depend upon many untried influences; some then existing, others unforeseen, and to be developed in the future, what the principal of those influences, favorable and unfavorable, were, it would be an interesting chapter to describe, but we cannot enter upon that subject here.

4. Many apparently insuperable obstacles having presented

themselves in the way of practically realizing, in its full form, the idea originally underlying the establishment of Franklin College, the German churches next took another step, mainly tentative in its character. If they could not have a full college in good working condition, could they not jointly establish a theological seminary for the training of a much needed ministry? The college or colleges might be provided for afterward. Necessity was upon them, and surely it was worth a trial. Historical progress had brought them now to this point. So we find that negotiations were begun with this end in view between the German Reformed and the Lutherans, who were near akin as to nationality; and between the German Reformed and the Dutch Reformed, who were near akin as to faith. In the minutes of the Reformed Synod of 1817, we are told that two committees were appointed, the one to confer with the New York, the other with the Pennsylvania Lutheran Synod, concerning the establishment of a theological school. The next year, 1818, the committee to the Pennsylvania Lutheran Synod reported that it had been most fraternally received, and that said synod had appointed a committee of five to arrange, with a similar committee of the Reformed Synod; more definitely the matters relating to a "Theological School." And so for several years afterwards, favorable reports were made on both sides, and a definite plan presented for common action. Two hundred copies of this plan were published for general distribution, by order of the Synod, in 1819. The tentative action between the German Reformed and the Dutch Reformed Synods in the same direction bore a like character. Similar forces were active in each body. Particulars will be found recorded in the minutes of the several synods from 1818 to 1821. Yet, in the end, none of these co-operative efforts were practically carried out. It was just as well. If they had been, their useful life would simply have been an interimistic one. As it proved, they were transitional. They bring us to the period when each of the German churches began to cast about for ways and means to found its own theological seminary, and growing out of this subsequently, its own college.

VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Counsellor of the Consistory, and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by John Walter Hope, M. A. Vol. I. Edinburg: T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street, 1883.

Of the many works on the Life of Christ which have appeared within the last fifty years none will be found by scholars more satisfactory than this. Its author, Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Professor in Berlin, is one of the most eminent Biblical scholars of the age, and in this work he gives to the public the result of twenty years of careful and thorough study. No other "Life of Christ," we have reason to believe, had so much time and research bestowed on it. The work in German is complete in two volumes, and falls into seven books of twelve chapters each. For a work so scholarly it is unusually attractive in style, and we feel assured that those who take it up for examination, will not be likely to stop short of reading the entire work.

The first volume of the English translation, the only one as yet issued, although the second volume may be published by the time this reaches our readers, contains the first two books which are introductory, together with the preface which consists of a dedicatory letter to Dr. George Voight, Professor of History in Leipsic. In his dedication of the work Dr. Weiss says: "The fact that my book deals with the historical origin of our religion constitutes what claim it has on your interest—and on that of every educated person. Indeed on the very first pages you will find the unconcealed avowal that religious faith, as regards certainty of itself, is and must remain independent of the result of historical investigation." He also further says: "I know right well that many will disagree not only with my method of treating Scripture, but also with inferences I have drawn, because these contradict many widespread notions, and were not gained from finished dogmatic opinions, but from unprejudiced testing of the sources, and because they do not exhibit the picture of Christ agreeably to the church's believing adoration of her exalted Redeemer, but as it appears from the standpoint of His earthly historical life. I must be prepared for many finding my views tinged with the spirit of rationalism or of modern criticism, although I have contested it step by step. But I decline beforehand having this laid before any kind of dogmatic tribunal, and appeal to the sources, not, indeed, according to their actual words, but according to the treatment which I believe I have demonstrated corresponds alone to their origin and character. I am far from thinking that I have discovered the last word in the solution of so many difficult questions; but I hope to have shown the way by which it may be found."

The first book treats of the sources of our knowledge of the life of Jesus in twelve chapters headed respectively, The Gospel of Christ

and the Gospels, Discovery of the Oldest Source, Memoirs of Peter, The Gospel of the Jewish Christians, The Gospel of the Gentile Christians, The Johannean Question, Historicity of the Gospel of John, Eye-Witness and Tradition, Legend and Myth, Fiction and Truth, The "Tendenz-Kritik," and The Historical Representation of the Life of Jesus. Under these various heads we have brought before us the latest results of New Testament criticism as regards the Gospels. All who feel any interest in acquainting themselves with this criticism will find this book especially instructive, whatever conclusions they may arrive at as regards the author's views.

The second book treats of the Preparation of Jesus for His public Ministry. It also is divided into twelve chapters. The following are the respective headings of these chapters: Home and Father's House, The Immaculate Conception, The Sign in the Hill Country of Judea, The Nativity in Bethlehem and Salutation in the Temple, Danger and Deliverance, In the Days of His Youth, The Messianic Calling, The Prophet at the Jordan, The Baptism of the Spirit, Temptation and Approval, Formation of the Earliest Discipleships, and At the Marriage in Cana. In these chapters we have not merely the facts of Jesus' life, as given in the Gospels, vividly described and chronologically arranged and harmonized, but a careful and thorough consideration and discussion of the questions and difficulties which these facts have given rise to in the minds of men. Though the solution this author gives of the various questions claiming attention, may not always be found perfectly satisfactory, yet we believe, there will be few who will not feel thankful to him for the light he throws on them.

The English translation we would yet add appears remarkably well done and is unusually readable for a translation of a German theological work.

THE BIBLE-WORK. (Or Bible Reader's Commentary.) The New Testament. In two volumes. Vol. I. The Fourfold Gospel, The Four Gospels Consolidated in a Continuous Narrative, Presenting the Life of Christ in the Order of Its Events; The Text Arranged in Sections; With Readings and Comments Selected from the Choicest, most Illuminating and Helpful Thoughts of the Christian Centuries. With Illustrations, Maps and Diagrams. Prepared by J. Glentworth Butler, D. D. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883.

Though the expectations awakened by the title page of this volume have not been altogether realized by us in the examination of its contents, yet we can, nevertheless, recommend the work as truly valuable and as one that will be found useful and convenient in the minister's study, as well as in the family for devotional reading. In it a large amount of matter selected from the writings of many of the best interpreters of Scripture is brought together to illustrate and explain the Gospel history and to enforce its precious truths. The plan of the work as we are told in the preface, is distinguished by the following features:

I. An orderly arrangement of the text in convenient portions, or *Sections*.

II. Appended to each section is a brief *Reading*. This comprises a few suggestive sentences related to the subject matter of the text, with more or less of an experimental bearing.

III. A complete but compact body of *Note and Comment*. This is explanatory of the sense, or meaning of the text and suggestive of the

underlying or interwoven spirit. It is descriptive of persons, places, customs and incidents.

IV. A special feature of this volume is the single continuous narrative constructed out of the Four Gospels, giving a complete and connected view of our Lord's life and ministry.

Besides other illustrations, the book contains also a number of interesting Maps, and Diagrams said to be prepared with the aid of the latest and most authoritative researches. These in our opinion constitute one of the most valuable features of the work.

The mechanical part of the work is excellent. The volume before us is a royal octavo of nearly seven hundred pages, very convenient to handle. It is printed on good paper in very distinct type, and bound in a neat and substantial style.

HOMILETICS. By James M. Hoppin, Professor in Yale College. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

This work which has recently been issued by Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls in a cheap yet very excellent form, is the most exhaustive treatise on Homiletics of which we have any knowledge. Every thing pertaining to the subject is treated with all the fullness and thoroughness that could be desired, and in a style which is copious and yet at the same time pure and finished, so that the book is an attractive as well as an instructive one. The contents of the volume fall into two principal parts, or divisions. Part First treats of "Homiletics Proper," and Part Second of "Rhetoric Applied to Preaching."

In the First Part, after a special introduction which gives the literature of Homiletics and Rhetoric, and the definition of homiletical terms, there are two hundred and thirty pages devoted to a very valuable and interesting history of preaching from the apostolic times down to our own. Then, in order, are discussed the Object of Preaching, the Preparation for Composing Sermons, the Analysis and Composition of Sermons, and the Classification of Sermons. All these subjects are treated not only in a very able and thorough, but, also, in a very judicious manner. In the Second Part the author discusses and illustrates, with equal ability and fulness, the General Principles of Rhetoric, Invention, and Style.

As regards the methods of delivery, while Professor Hoppin does not condemn the reading of sermons and memoriter preaching, and sees some special advantages in both these methods, he yet favors most extemporaneous preaching. This, he declares, "is really the most philosophical method, and comes nearest to the ideal of preaching, which is the bringing to bear a personal influence upon hearers." He does not, however, neglect also to say, that "Everything in extemporaneous speaking depends on a complete mastery of the subject," and that "if one does not give as much study to this method of preaching as to any other, or even more, he will not succeed in it."

After what has been said it is scarcely necessary to add that the work is one that should find a place in every minister's library. Young ministers just entering on the work of preaching will find it almost invaluable as a guide, while older ministers will do well to read over its pages occasionally as a reminder of the faults they should strive to avoid, and of the excellencies which they should ever seek to cultivate.

THE FREEDOM OF FAITH. By Theodore T. Munger, Author of "On the Threshold." Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1883.

This is a volume made up of seventeen sermons on various subjects, together with a prefatory essay on "The New Theology." The work is no ordinary one, and it has already received wide and deserved notice not only from the religious, but, also, from the secular press.

The prefatory essay is specially note-worthy. In it the author gives a very clear and, we believe, substantially correct account of "The New Theology" which is at this time agitating the minds of many. He assures us that it does not propose to do without a theology, nor to part with the historic faith of the church, nor to reject the specific doctrines of the church of the past. Neither, he further tells us, is it iconoclastic in its temper, nor disposed to find a field and organization outside of existing churches. The following he gives as its positive features:

1. It claims for itself a somewhat larger and broader use of the reason than has been accorded to theology.

2. The New Theology seeks to interpret the Scriptures in what may be called a more natural way, and in opposition to a hard, formal, unsympathetic, and unimaginative way.

3. The New Theology seeks to replace an excessive individuality by a truer view of the solidarity of the race.

4. This theology recognizes a new relation to natural science; but only in the respect that it ignores the long apparent antagonism between the kingdoms of faith and natural law,—an antagonism that cannot, from the nature of things, have a basis in reality.

5. The New Theology offers a contrast to the Old in claiming for itself a wider study of man.

6. The New Theology recognizes the necessity of a restatement of belief in Eschatology, or the doctrine of Last Things.

These various features he discusses in the essay at considerable length and with marked ability. Those, therefore, who desire to understand the leading characteristics of the New Theology will do well to acquaint themselves thoroughly with this essay.

The sermons which follow the essay may be said to show the practical working of the New Theology of which the author is a representative. They are written in a very attractive style, and are replete with profound thought. Whatever exception may be taken to some of the views advanced in them, no one can well deny their earnestness and spiritual power. Among the subjects treated in the sermons are the Reception of New Truth, Moral Environment, Immortality and Science, The Christ's Treatment of Death, Life a Gain, and Things to be Awaited. Those who take up the volume will not be likely to lay it aside before reading it through.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. By Professors Boardman, Curtiss and Scott, of Chicago Theological Seminary. Volume one. Introductory. Chicago: F. H. Revell, 1883.

The authors of this work state in the preface that it is proposed to give an annual digest of the most important contributions in exegetical, historical, systematic and practical theology, in a popular yet accurate way, for the purpose of aiding ministers and theological students in keeping themselves abreast of the thinking and investigations of our times in the various departments of theology. Of this series the present volume is the first, and, as stated on the title page, introductory. We trust the

publisher and authors will be encouraged to carry out what they propose, and that other volumes will follow in due time. Such a work is really needed by most ministers, and, if prepared with proper care, could not fail to be of great service to them.

As for the present volume we are much pleased with it, although it is not as full in some respects as could be desired. It consists of three parts. The First Part is by Rev. Samuel Ives Curtiss, and treats of the "Present State of Old Testament Studies;" the Second Part is by Rev. Hugh M. Scott, and discusses "Church History: Its Idea, Contents and Method of Treatment as Apprehended in the Present State of the Science, with some notice of Auxiliary Studies;" the Third Part is by Rev. George N. Boardman, and describes "Present Theological Tendencies and the Influences Producing Them." All these subjects are treated with marked ability and much useful information is given in the discussion of them. The Third Part which is divided into three chapters treating respectively of Doctrines under Discussion, Dörner's System of Christian Doctrine, and Religion as a Philosophy, is especially interesting. We heartily commend the work to all who are desirous of keeping themselves informed as to all the theological movements of the times.

SCOTTISH CHARACTERISTICS. By Paxton Hood, Author of "Christmas Evans," "Oliver Cromwell," "Romance of Biography," etc, etc. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

People of every nationality, and, indeed, of every class, have their marked characteristics which not only distinguish them, but, also, not unfrequently, make them amusing to others. In the present volume we have portrayed those of Scotchmen. The old Scottish minister, the old Scottish lawyer, and the old Scottish lady are brought before us with all their peculiarities, and the characteristics of Scottish humor, and the humor of Scottish character, and of the Scottish dialect, together with some varieties of Scottish superstitions, Scottish proverbial philosophy, and the old Scottish Sabbath, are graphically described. Under the caption of *The Old Scottish Minister* we find the following. "In 1762 Dr. Thomas Blacklock, the well-known poet, was presented by the Earl of Selkirk to the living of Kirkcudbright. He was afflicted by the loss of sight, but, when he was preaching one of his trial discourses, an old woman who sat on the pulpit stairs inquired of a neighbor whether he was a reader. 'He canna be a reader,' said the old wife, 'for he is blin'. 'I'm glad to hear it,' said the ancient neighbor; 'I wish they were all blin'!" More agreeable entertainment for recreation, or for an idle hour, could scarcely anywhere be found.

HISTORICAL AND OTHER SKETCHES. By James Anthony Froude. Edited with an Introduction by David H. Wheeler. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

These sketches are both profitable and pleasant reading, and admirably suited to the purpose of introducing to the general reader the writings of one who "is among the best masters, living or dead, of the art of writing the English language." Though the principle which has guided President Wheeler of Allegheny College, the editor in this selection from the works of Mr. Froude, excludes most of his best known essays, and such of his writings as have excited heated controversy, the volume nevertheless gives a fair idea of Mr. Froude's style and power as a writer. The Introduction by the editor gives an interesting account of Mr. Froude's education, works, opinions, controversies and style, and adds considerably to the value of the volume. The information thus

given enables the reader to understand and estimate better the writings of Mr. Froude, and is fuller than any given elsewhere so far as we know.

JEWISH ARTISAN LIFE IN THE TIME OF JESUS, According to the Oldest Sources. By Franz Delitzsch, D. D., Professor of Theology in Leipsic. Translated from the third Revised Edition. By Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph. D. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

This is a truly valuable volume. The name of its author, Dr. Franz Delitzsch, Professor of Theology in Leipsic, in itself, is a sufficient testimony as to its merits. The book consists of four chapters which we understand were originally delivered as lectures to a circle of young mechanics. In these chapters there is given a large amount of very interesting information respecting Jewish artisan life in the time of our Saviour. This information is valuable as it sheds considerable light on the conditions under which the human life of our blessed Lord was unfolded, and thus enables us more vividly to realize the circumstances amid which He grew to man's estate.

SCIENTIFIC SOPHISMS. A Review of Current Theories Concerning Atoms, Apes, and Men. By Samuel Wainwright, D. D., Author of "Christian Certainty," "The Modern Avernus," etc. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

This volume like the three volumes just noticed belongs to the "Standard Library" published in such remarkably cheap yet attractive form by Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls. In our opinion, however, it is inferior to the other volumes of the series so far as yet issued. Many may think Dr. Wainwright's review of current theories brilliant and scathing, but it does not commend itself to us. We seriously doubt whether the interests of religious truth are ever promoted by such discussion of Scientific subjects. Unquestionably Scientists are guilty of many sophisms, but Dr. Wainwright's treatment of them strikes us as also sophistical.



r. 30
VOL. V.

N. J. Miller.
NEW SERIES.

No. 1.

THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D. D.,
Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa.

JOHN M. TITZEL, D. D.,
Altoona, Pa.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

VOLUME XXX.

JANUARY, 1883.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 ARCH STREET.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR, TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE.

CONTENTS OF JANUARY NUMBER, 1883.

ARTICLE	I.—The Inspiration of the Bible.	5
	By Rev. J. W. NEVIN, D.D., LL.D.	
"	II.—Christian Life Deeper than Conscious Experience.	40
	By Rev. THOS. G. APPLE, D.D.	
"	III.—Central Issues of Modern Criticism.	65
	By Rev. I. E. GRAEFF.	
"	IV.—The Atonement.	82
	By Rev. C. Z. WEISER, D.D.	
"	V.—The Necessity of an Objective Revelation.	97
	By Rev. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.	
"	VI.—Christian Unity.	109
	By Rev. J. M. TITZEL, D.D.	
"	VII.—The Necessity of Faith for the Right Study of History.	126
	By Rev. GEO. W. SNYDER.	
"	VIII.—Book Notices.	129

"ITS VALUE INCREASES EVERY YEAR."—*The Churchman, N.Y.*



THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORS, such as

Prof. MAX MULLER,
 Rt. Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE,
 JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE,
 Prof. HUXLEY,
 RICHARD A. PROCTOR,
 Prof. GOLDWIN SMITH,
 EDWARD A. FREEMAN,
 Prof. TYNDALL,
 Dr. W. B. CARPENTER,
 FRANCES POWER CORBE,

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL,
 WILLIAM BLACK,
 Miss THACKERAY,
 Mrs. MULOCH-CRAIK,
 GEORGE MACDONALD,
 Mrs. OLIPHANT,
 Mrs. ALEXANDER,
 Mrs. PARR,
 JEAN INGELOW,
 THOMAS HARDY,

MATTHEW ARNOLD,
 J. NORMAN LOCKYER,
 FRANCIS W. NEWMAN,
 ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE,
 FRANCIS GALTON,
 W. H. MALLOCK,
 W. W. STORY,
 RUSKIN,
 TENNYSON,
 BROWNING,

and many others, are represented in the pages of

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

IN 1853 THE LIVING AGE enters upon the fortieth year of its publication. Originally commended by President Adams, Judge Story, Chancellor Kent, historians Sparks, Prescott, Ticknor, Bancroft, and many others, it has constantly received the support of the best men and journals of the country, and has met with uninterrupted success. A WEEKLY MAGAZINE of sixty-four pages, it gives more than

Three and a Quarter Thousand

double-column octavo pages of reading-matter yearly, forming four large volumes. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a satisfactory completeness attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and Discovery, Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical, and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature.

During the coming year, Serial and Short Stories by the Leading Foreign Authors will be given, together with an amount

Unapproached by any other Periodical

in the world, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day from the pens of the foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors, above-named and many others, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

The importance of THE LIVING AGE to every American reader, as the only satisfactorily fresh and complete compilation of a generally inaccessible but indispensable current literature,—indispensable because it embraces the productions of

THE ABLEST LIVING WRITERS

in all branches of Literature, Science, Art, and Politics,—is sufficiently indicated by the following recent

Opinions.

"LITTELL'S LIVING AGE has now for many years held the first place of all our serial publications. . . There is nothing noteworthy in science, art, literature, biography, philosophy, or religion, that cannot be found in it. . . The volumes, as they successively appear, must be the despair of the critic. They are so uniformly excellent, and with excellence of such a high character, that they exhaust his terms of praise."—*The Churchman, New York.*
 "There is no better medium of keeping one's self well informed in regard to the intellectual condition of the day."—*New York Observer.*

"The ablest essays and reviews of the day are to be found here."—*The Presbyterian, Philadelphia.*

"It stands easily at the head of its class and deserves its prosperity."—*The Congregationalist, Boston.*

"No other publication can supply its place. It furnishes indispensable reading. . . It contains not only the best solid literature, but also the best serial stories of the day. . . Its pages are sufficient to keep any reader abreast with the best printed thoughts of the best of our contemporary writers."—*Episcopal Register, Philadelphia.*

"Whatever else in current literature we may have, we cannot well afford to be without THE LIVING AGE."—*Lutheran Observer, Philadelphia.*

"It enables its readers to keep fully abreast of the best thought and literature of civilization."—*Pittsburgh Christian Advocate.*

"In no other form with which we are acquainted is so much valuable and interesting reading for so small an outlay placed within the reach of the public. . . The indispensable among magazines."—*Pacific Churchman, San Francisco.*

"It is for readers of limited leisure or purse the most convenient and available means of possessing themselves of the very best results of current criticism, philosophy, science and literature."—*Presbyterian Banner, Pittsburgh.*

"Its weekly deliveries have been hailed with delight for more than a generation."—*Christian Register, Boston.*

"As much a necessity as ever."—*The Advance, Chicago.*

"The best and cheapest periodical in America."—*Evangelical Churchman, Toronto.*

"It retains its traits of catholicity, breadth of scope, and discriminating selection, which have marked it from the beginning. . . It is simply indispensable."—*Boston Journal.*

"No other periodical can compare with it in interest and value."—*Boston Traveller.*

"No reader who makes himself familiar with its contents can lack the means of a sound literary culture."—*New York Tribune.*

"As well conducted as ever."—*New York World.*

"Through its pages alone it is possible to be as well informed in current literature as by the perusal of a long list of monthlies. . . In it we find the best productions of the best writers upon all subjects ready to our hand."—*Philadelphia Inquirer.*

"Since its first appearance, nearly forty years ago, it has been far ahead of all competition in English-speaking lands."—*Philadelphia Evening News.*

"It is indispensable in every household where any attempt is made to keep up with the current thought of the day."—*Hartford Courant.*

"It furnishes a complete compilation of an indispensable literature."—*Chicago Evening Journal.*

"As much in the forefront of eclectic publications as at its start forty years ago."—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

"It being a weekly publication, is, comparatively speaking, the cheapest magazine published."—*Commercial Advertiser, Detroit.*

"Grows better as the years roll on."—*Indianapolis Journal.*

"It is the most valuable acquisition that could be made to any magazine table."—*Leavenworth Times.*

"The oldest and best."—*Courier-Journal, Louisville.*

"It affords the best, the cheapest, and most convenient means of keeping abreast with the progress of thought in all its phases."—*North American, Philadelphia.*

"The great eclectic of the world."—*Morning Star, Wilmington, N.C.*

"Whatever may be the competition for public favor, it always holds its place. . . The best of magazines to subscribe to."—*Montreal Gazette.*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, at \$3.00 a year, free of postage.

CLUB PRICES FOR THE BEST HOME AND FOREIGN LITERATURE.

"Possessed of 'LITTELL'S LIVING AGE,' and of one or other of our vivacious American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in command of the whole situation."—*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.*

For \$10.50, THE LIVING AGE and any one of the four-dollar monthly magazines (or *Harper's Weekly* or *Basar*) will be sent for a year, with postage prepaid on both; or, for \$9.50, THE LIVING AGE and the *St. Nicholas* or *Lippincott's Monthly*, postpaid.

ADDRESS

LITTELL & CO., 17 Bromfield St., Boston.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The MERCERSBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church, located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., while it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature, in common with the theological quarterlies of this and other countries. It became thus more or less identified with the study of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg School. For a period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church of the United States has been making a liberal contribution and established other literary and theological institutions. Much has been made also in the theological life of Christianity and the Church throughout the world.

In dropping its old name and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological Quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most irenical confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it invites to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold to that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will continue to labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning as these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary in the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The QUARTERLY REVIEW will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion, when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D.D. and J. M. Titzel, D.D. assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 136 pages.

The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for the views of individual writers.

TERMS:

THREE DOLLARS per year; to be paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers, accompanied with \$18.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and all letters relating to the Editorial Department, must be directed to Thos. G. Apple, D.D. at Lancaster, Pa. Manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, may be sent to either of the Editors.

VOL. V.

NEW SERIES.

No. 2.

THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D.,

Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster Pa.

JOHN M. TITZEL, D.D.,

Altoona, Pa.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

VOLUME XXX.

APRIL, 1883.

PHILADELPHIA:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 ARCH STREET.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR, TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE.

CONTENTS OF APRIL NUMBER, 1883.

ARTICLE	I.—Prohibitory Temperance Legislation.	141.
	By Rev. J. SPANGLER KIEFFER.	
"	II.—The Reason as an Ideal Power.	178.
	By Rev. ALLEN TRAVER.	
"	III.—The Moral Nature of Man.	198
	By Rev. DR. C. R. LANE.	
"	IV.—Who are the Elect?	212
	By Rev. W. RUPP.	
"	V.—On the Significance of Greek Culture.	241
	By Prof. JOHN B. KIEFFER.	
"	VI.—Notices of New Books.	268

"ITS VALUE INCREASES EVERY YEAR."—*The Churchman, N.Y.*



THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORS, such as

Prof. MAX MULLER,
Rt. Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE,
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE,
Prof. HUXLEY,
RICHARD A. PROCTOR,
Prof. GOLDWIN SMITH,
EDWARD A. FREEMAN,
Prof. TYNDALL,
Dr. W. B. CARPENTER,
FRANCES POWER COBBE,

THE DUKE OF ABERLY,
WILLIAM BLACK,
Miss THACKERAY,
Mrs. MULOCK-CRAIK,
GEORGE MACDONALD,
Mrs. OLIPHANT,
Mrs. ALEXANDER,
Mrs. FARR,
JEAN INGELW,
THOMAS HARDY,

MATTHEW ARNOLD,
J. NORMAN LOCKYER,
FRANCIS W. NEWMAN,
ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE,
FRANCIS GALTON,
W. H. MALLOCK,
W. W. STORY,
ROBBIN,
TENNYSON,
BROWNING,

and many others, are represented in the pages of

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

In 1883 THE LIVING AGE enters upon the fortieth year of its publication. Originally commended by President Adams, Judge Story, Chancellor Kent, historians Sparks, Prescott, Ticknor, Bancroft, and many others, it has constantly received the support of the best men and journals of the country, and has met with uninterrupted success. A WEEKLY MAGAZINE of sixty-four pages, it gives more than

Three and a Quarter Thousand

double-column octavo pages of reading-matter yearly, forming four large volumes. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a satisfactory completeness attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and Discovery, Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical, and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature.

During the coming year, Serial and Short Stories by the Leading Foreign Authors will be given, together with an amount

Unapproached by any other Periodical

In the world, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day from the pens of the foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors, above-named and many others, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

The importance of THE LIVING AGE to every American reader, as the only satisfactorily fresh and complete compilation of a generally inaccessible but indispensable current literature,—indispensable because it embraces the productions of

THE ABLEST LIVING WRITERS

in all branches of Literature, Science, Art, and Politics,—is sufficiently indicated by the following recent

Opinions.

"LITTELL'S LIVING AGE has now for many years held the first place of all our serial publications. . . There is nothing noteworthy in science, art, literature, biography, philosophy, or religion, that cannot be found in it. . . The volumes, as they successively appear, must be the despair of the critic. They are so uniformly excellent, and with excellence of such a high character, that they exhaust his terms of praise."—*The Churchman, New York.*

"There is no better medium of keeping one's self well informed in regard to the intellectual condition of the day."—*New York Observer.*

"The ablest essays and reviews of the day are to be found here."—*The Presbyterian, Philadelphia.*

"It stands easily at the head of its class and deserves its prosperity."—*The Congregationalist, Boston.*

"No other publication can supply its place. It furnishes indispensable reading. . . It contains not only the best solid literature, but also the best serial stories of the day. . . Its pages are sufficient to keep any reader abreast with the best printed thoughts of the best of our contemporary writers."—*Episcopal Register, Philadelphia.*

"Whatever else in current literature we may have, we cannot well afford to be without THE LIVING AGE."—*Lutheran Observer, Philadelphia.*

"It enables its readers to keep fully abreast of the best thought and literature of civilization."—*Pittsburgh Christian Advocate.*

"In no other form with which we are acquainted is so much valuable and interesting reading for so small an outlay placed within the reach of the public. . . The indispensable among magazines."—*Pacific Churchman, San Francisco.*

"It is for readers of limited leisure or pursue the most convenient and available means of possessing themselves of the very best results of current criticism, philosophy, science and literature."—*Presbyterian Banner, Pittsburgh.*

"Its weekly deliverances have been hailed with delight for more than a generation."—*Christian Register, Boston.*

"As much a necessity as ever."—*The Advance, Chicago.*

"The best and cheapest periodical in America."—*Evangelical Churchman, Toronto.*

"It retains its traits of catholicity, breadth of scope, and discriminating selection, which have marked it from the beginning. . . It is simply indispensable."—*Boston Journal.*

"No other periodical can compare with it in interest and value."—*Boston Traveller.*

"No reader who makes himself familiar with its contents can lack the means of a sound literary culture."—*New York Tribune.*

"As well conducted as ever."—*New York World.*

"Through its pages alone it is possible to be as well informed in current literature as by the perusal of a long list of monthlies. . . In it we find the best productions of the best writers upon all subjects ready to our hand."—*Philadelphia Inquirer.*

"Since its first appearance, nearly forty years ago, it has been far ahead of all competition in English-speaking lands."—*Philadelphia Evening News.*

"It is indispensable in every household where any attempt is made to keep up with the current thought of the day."—*Harford Courant.*

"It furnishes a complete compilation of an indispensable literature."—*Chicago Evening Journal.*

"As much in the forefront of eclectic publications as at its start forty years ago."—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

"It being a weekly publication, is comparatively speaking, the cheapest magazine published."—*Commercial Advertiser, Detroit.*

"Grows better as the years roll on."—*Indianapolis Journal.*

"It is the most valuable acquisition that could be made to any magazine table."—*Leavenworth Times.*

"The oldest and best."—*Courier-Journal, Louisville.*

"It affords the best, the cheapest, and most convenient means of keeping abreast with the progress of thought in all its phases."—*North American, Philadelphia.*

"The great eclectic of the world."—*Morning Star, Wilmington, N.C.*

"Whatever may be the competition for public favor, it always holds its place. . . The best of magazines to subscribe to."—*Montreal Gazette.*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, at \$3.00 a year, free of postage.

CLUB PRICES FOR THE BEST HOME AND FOREIGN LITERATURE.

["Possessed of 'LITTELL'S LIVING AGE,' and of one or other of our vivacious American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in command of the whole situation."—*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.*]

For \$10.50, THE LIVING AGE and any one of the four-dollar monthly magazines (or *Harper's Weekly* or *Bazar*) will be sent for a year, with postage prepaid on both; or, for \$9.50, THE LIVING AGE and the *St. Nicholas* or *Lippincott's Monthly*, postpaid.

ADDRESS

LITTELL & CO., 17 Bromfield St., Boston.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The MERCERSBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church, located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., while it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature, in common with the theological quarterlies of this and other countries. It became thus more or less identified with a school of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportion and established other literary and Christian institutions, while great progress has been made also in the theological life of the Church throughout the world.

In dropping the *Jan 82* and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most irenical confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it invites to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold to that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will continue to labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning as these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary in the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The QUARTERLY REVIEW will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion, when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D.D. and J. M. Titzel, D.D. assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 136 pages.

The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for the views of individual writers.

TERMS:

THREE DOLLARS per year; to be paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers, accompanied with \$18.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to the publishers.

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to Thos. G. Apple, D.D. at Lancaster, Pa.

VOL. V.

NEW SERIES.

No. 3.

THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D. D.,

Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster Pa.

JOHN M. TITZEL, D. D.,

Altoona, Pa.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

VOLUME XXX.

JULY, 1883.

PHILADELPHIA:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 ARCH STREET.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR, TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE.

CONTENTS OF JULY NUMBER, 1883.

ARTICLE I.—The Drift of Modern Thought.	277
By Rev. S. N. Callender, D. D.	
“ II.—A Two-edged Sword.	307
By Rev. Prof. J. S. STAHR.	
“ III.—Christian Union.	330
By Rev. C. Z. WEISER, D. D.	
“ IV.—Woman Suffrage.	343
By Rev. CYRUS CORT.	
“ V.—Depravity.	365
By Rev. DR. C. R. LANE.	
“ VI.—The Beginnings of our Literary Institutions.	380
By Rev. FRANKLIN K. LEVAN, A. M.	
“ VII.—Christmas Season.	391
By Rev. M. KIEFFER, D. D.	
“ VIII.—Notices of New Books.	403

"ITS VALUE INCREASES EVERY YEAR."—*The Churchman, N. Y.*



THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORS, such as

Prof. MAX MULLER,
Rt. Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE,
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE,
Prof. HUXLEY,
RICHARD A. PROCTOR,
Prof. GOLDWIN SMITH,
EDWARD A. FREEMAN,
Prof. TYNDALL,
Dr. W. B. CARPENTER,
FRANCES POWER COBBE,

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL,
WILLIAM BLACK,
Miss THACKERAY,
Mrs. MURCK-CRAIK,
GEORGE MACDONALD,
Mrs. OLIPHANT,
Mrs. ALEXANDER,
Mrs. FARR,
JEAN INGELW,
THOMAS HARDY,

MATTHEW ARNOLD,
J. NORMAN LOCKYER,
FRANCIS W. NEWMAN,
ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE,
FRANCIS GALTON,
W. H. MALLOCK,
W. H. STORRY,
RUSKIN,
TENNANT,
BROWNING,

and many others, are represented in the pages of

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

IN 1853 THE LIVING AGE enters upon the fortieth year of its publication. Originally commended by President Adams, Judge Story, Chancellor Kent, historians Sparks, Prescott, Ticknor, Bancroft, and many others, it has constantly received the support of the best men and journals of the country, and has met with uninterrupted success. A WEEKLY MAGAZINE of sixty-four pages, it gives more than

Three and a Quarter Thousand

double-column octavo pages of reading-matter yearly, forming four large volumes. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a satisfactory completeness attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and Discovery, Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical, and Political information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature.

During the coming year, Serial and Short Stories by the Leading Foreign Authors will be given, together with an amount

Unapproached by any other Periodical

In the world, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day from the pens of the foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors, above-named and many others, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

The importance of THE LIVING AGE to every American reader, as the only satisfactorily fresh and complete compilation of a generally inaccessible but indispensable current literature,—indispensable because it embraces the productions of

THE ABLEST LIVING WRITERS

in all branches of Literature, Science, Art, and Politics,—is sufficiently indicated by the following recent Opinions.

"LITTELL'S LIVING AGE has now for many years held the first place of all our serial publications. . . There is nothing noteworthy in science, art, literature, biography, philosophy, or religion, that cannot be found in it. The volumes, as they successively appear, must be the despair of the critic. They are so uniformly excellent, and with concision of such a high character, that they exhaust his terms of praise."—*The Churchman, New York.*
"There is no better medium of keeping one's self well informed in regard to the intellectual condition of the day."—*New York Observer.*

"The ablest essays and reviews of the day are to be found here."—*The Presbyterian, Philadelphia.*

"It stands easily at the head of its class and deserves its prosperity."—*The Congregationalist, Boston.*

"No other publication can supply its place. It furnishes indispensable reading. . . it contains not only the best solid literature, but also the best serial stories of the day. . . its pages are sufficient to keep any reader abreast with the best printed thoughts of the best of our contemporary writers."—*Episcopal Register, Philadelphia.*

"Whatever else in current literature we may have, we cannot well afford to be without THE LIVING AGE."—*Lutheran Observer, Philadelphia.*

"It enables its readers to keep fully abreast of the best thought and literature of civilization."—*Pittsburgh Christian Advocate.*

"In no other form with which we are acquainted is so much valuable and interesting reading for so small an outlay placed within the reach of the public. . . The indispensable among magazines."—*Pacific Churchman, San Francisco.*

"It is for readers of limited leisure or pursue the most convenient and available means of possessing themselves of the very best results of current criticism, philosophy, science and literature."—*Presbyterian Banner, Pittsburgh.*

"Its weekly deliverances have been hailed with delight for more than a generation."—*Christian Register, Boston.*

"As much a necessity as ever."—*The Advance, Chicago.*
"The best and cheapest periodical in America."—*Evangelical Churchman, Toronto.*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, at \$3.00 a year, free of postage.

"It retains its traits of catholicity, breadth of scope, and discriminating selection, which have marked it from the beginning. . . It is simply indispensable."—*Boston Journal.*

"No other periodical can compare with it in interest and value."—*Boston Traveller.*

"No reader who makes himself familiar with its contents can lack the means of a sound literary culture."—*New York Tribune.*

"As well conducted as ever."—*New York World.*

"Through its pages alone it is possible to be as well informed in current literature as by the perusal of a long list of monthlies. . . In it we find the best productions of the best writers upon all subjects ready to our hand."—*Philadelphia Inquirer.*

"Since its first appearance, nearly forty years ago, it has been far ahead of all competition in English-speaking lands."—*Philadelphia Evening News.*

"It is indispensable in every household where any attempt is made to keep up with the current thought of the day."—*Hartford Courant.*

"It furnishes a complete compilation of an indispensable literature."—*Chicago Evening Journal.*

"As much in the forefront of eclectic publications as at its start forty years ago."—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

"It being a weekly publication, is comparatively weakling, the cheapest magazine published."—*Commercial Advertiser, Detroit.*

"Grows better as the years roll on."—*Indianapolis Journal.*

"It is the most valuable acquisition that could be made to any magazine table."—*Leavenworth Times.*

"The oldest and best."—*Courier-Journal, Louisville.*

"It affords the best, the cheapest, and most convenient means of keeping abreast with the progress of thought in all its phases."—*North American, Philadelphia.*

"The great eclectic of the world."—*Morning Star, Wilmington, N. C.*

"Whatever may be the competition for public favor, it always holds its place. The best of magazines to subscribe to."—*Massachusetts Gazette.*

CLUB PRICES FOR THE BEST HOME AND FOREIGN LITERATURE.

"Possessed of 'LITTELL'S LIVING AGE,' and of one or other of our vigorous American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in command of the whole situation."—*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.*

For \$10.50, THE LIVING AGE and any one of the four-dollar monthly magazines (or *Harper's Weekly* or *Essex*) will be sent for a year, with postage prepaid on both; or, for \$9.50, THE LIVING AGE and the *St. Nicholas* or *Lippincott's Monthly*, postpaid.

ADDRESS

LITTELL & CO., 17 Bromfield St., Boston.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

The MERCERSBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa. It has been common with the general interest of science and literature, in this and other countries. It became thus more or less identified with a school of thought and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportion and established other literary and theological institutions, while great progress has been made also in the theological life of Christianity and the Church throughout the world.

In dropping its old name and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological Quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most irenic confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it invites to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold to that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will continue to labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning as these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary in the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The QUARTERLY REVIEW will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion, when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D.D. and J. M. Titzel, D.D. assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 136 pages.

The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for the views of individual writers.

TERMS:

THREE DOLLARS per year; to be paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers, accompanied with \$18.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and all letters relating to the Editorial Department, must be directed to Thos. G. Apple, D.D. at Lancaster, Pa. Manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, may be sent to either of the Editors.

VOL. V.

NEW SERIES.

No. 4.

THE
REFORMED
Quarterly Review.

EDITORS:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D. D.,

Professor in the Theological Seminary, Lancaster Pa.

JOHN M. TITZEL, D. D.,

Altoona, Pa.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

VOLUME XXX.

OCTOBER, 1883.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 ARCH STREET.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE.

CONTENTS OF OCTOBER NUMBER, 1883.

ARTICLE I.—First Principles; or, The Science of Things.	413
By Rev. THEODORE APPEL, D. D.	
“ II.—A Politico-Economic Problem.	450
By Hon. J. S. HESS, A. M.	
“ III.—Morality in the Public Schools.	467
By Rev. GEORGE F. MULL.	
“ IV.—Regeneration.	488
By Rev. DR. C. R. LANE.	
“ V.—Life and Immortality.	506
By Rev. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.	
“ VI.—The Beginnings of our Literary Institutions.	518
By Rev. F. K. LEVAN, A. M.	
“ VII.—Notices of New Books.	535

"ITS VALUE INCREASES EVERY YEAR."—*The Churchman, N. Y.*



THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORS, such as

Prof. MAX MULLER,
Rt. Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE,
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE,
Prof. HUXLEY,
RICHARD A. PROCTOR,
Prof. GOLDWIN SMITH,
EDWARD A. FREEMAN,
Prof. TYNDALL,
Dr. W. B. CARPENTER,
FRANCES POWER COBBE,

THE DUKE OF ABOVLL,
WILLIAM BLACK,
MISS THACKERAY,
MRS. MULOCK-CRAIK,
GEORGE MACDONALD,
MRS. OLIPHANT,
MRS. ALEXANDER,
MRS. PARR,
JEAN INGELW,
THOMAS HADY,

MATTHEW ARNOLD,
J. NORMAN LOCKYER,
FRANCIS W. NEWMAN,
ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE,
FRANCIS GALTON,
W. H. MALLOCK,
W. W. STORY,
RUSKIN,
TENNYSON,
BROWNING,

and many others, are represented in the pages of

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

IN 1883 THE LIVING AGE enters upon the fortieth year of its publication. Originally commended by President Adams, Judge Story, Chancellor Kent, historians Sparks, Prescott, Ticknor, Bancroft, and many others, it has constantly received the support of the best men and journals of the country, and has met with uninterrupted success. A WEEKLY MAGAZINE of sixty-four pages, it gives more than

Three and a Quarter Thousand

double-column octavo pages of reading-matter yearly, forming four large volumes. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a satisfactory completeness attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and Discovery, Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical, and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature.

During the coming year, Serial and Short Stories by the Leading Foreign Authors will be given, together with an amount

Unapproached by any other Periodical

in the world, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day from the pens of the foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors, above-named and many others, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

The importance of THE LIVING AGE to every American reader, as the only satisfactorily fresh and complete compilation of a generally inaccessible but indispensable current literature,—indispensable because it embraces the productions of

THE ABLEST LIVING WRITERS

in all branches of Literature, Science, Art, and Politics,—is sufficiently indicated by the following recent Opinions.

"LITTELL'S LIVING AGE has now for many years held the first place of all our serial publications. There is nothing noteworthy in science, art, literature, biography, philosophy, or religion, that cannot be found in it. The volumes, as they successively appear, must be the despair of the critic. They are so uniformly excellent, and with excellence of such a high character, that they exhaust his terms of praise."—*The Churchman, New York.*

"There is no better medium of keeping one's self well informed in regard to the intellectual condition of the day."—*New York Observer.*

"The ablest essays and reviews of the day are to be found here."—*The Presbyterian, Philadelphia.*

"It stands easily at the head of its class and deserves its prosperity."—*The Congregationalist, Boston.*

"No other publication can supply its place. It furnishes indispensable reading. It contains not only the best solid literature, but also the best serial stories of the day. Its pages are sufficient to keep any reader abreast with the best printed thoughts of the best of our contemporary writers."—*Episcopal Register, Philadelphia.*

"Whatever else in current literature we may have, we cannot well afford to be without THE LIVING AGE."—*Lutheran Observer, Philadelphia.*

"It enables its readers to keep fully abreast of the best thought and literature of civilization."—*Pittsburgh Christian Advocate.*

"In no other form with which we are acquainted is so much valuable and interesting reading for so small an outlay placed within the reach of the public. The indispensable among magazines."—*Pacific Churchman, San Francisco.*

"It is for readers of limited leisure or purse the most convenient and available means of possessing themselves of the very best results of current criticism, philosophy, science and literature."—*Presbyterian Banner, Pittsburgh.*

"Its weekly deliverances have been hailed with delight for more than a generation."—*Christian Register, Boston.*

"As much a necessity as ever."—*The Advance, Chicago.*

"The best and cheapest periodical in America."—*Evangelical Churchman, Toronto.*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, at \$3.00 a year, free of postage.

CLUB PRICES FOR THE BEST HOME AND FOREIGN LITERATURE.

"Possessed of 'LITTELL'S LIVING AGE,' and of one or other of our vivacious American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in command of the whole situation."—*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.*

For \$10.50, THE LIVING AGE and any one of the four-dollar monthly magazines (or *Harper's Weekly* or *Bazar*) will be sent for a year, with postage prepaid on both; or, for \$9.50, THE LIVING AGE and the *St. Nicholas* or *Lippincott's Monthly*, postpaid.

ADDRESS

LITTELL & CO., 17 Bromfield St., Boston.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

The MERCEBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church, located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., while it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature, in common with the theological quarterlies of this and other countries. It became thus more identified with a school of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportion and established other literary and theological institutions, with great progress has been made also in the theological life of Christianity and the Church throughout the world.

In dropping its old name and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological Quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most irenical confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and invites to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold to that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will continue to labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning as these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary in the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The QUARTERLY REVIEW will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D.D. and J. M. Titzel, D.D. assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 136 pages.

The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for the views of individual writers.

TERMS:

THREE DOLLARS per year; to be paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers, accompanied with \$15.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to the publishers.

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and all letters relating to the Editorial Department, must be directed to Thos. G. Apple, D.D. at Lancaster, Pa. Manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, may be sent to either of the Editors.

Buckley

